DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 475 CE 013 242

AUTHOR	Cronin, F. Patrick, Comp.; Newton, Mark, Comp.
TITLE	Improving the Quality and Quantity of Vocational Education in Corrections. National Conference on Vocational Education in Corrections (Houston, Texas, May 16-18, 1977). Leadership Training Series No. 53.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Educational Systems Development.; Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus. Div. of Vocational Education.
PUB DATE	Jun 77
NOTE	218p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Vocational Education Publications, Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($13.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Correctional Education; *Correctional Rehabilitation; Delinquent Rehabilitation; Delinquents; Delivery Systems; *Educational Accountability; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; Females; Financial Support; *Individual Needs; Information Dissemination; Information Systems; Interagency Cooperation; Job Placement; Occupational Information; Prisoners; Program Administration; *Program Development; Program Improvement; Program Planning; Staff Improvement; Vocational Development; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Objectives of the conference, proceedings of which are described in this report, were to (1) provide decision makers with information designed to foster the continued development of essential attitudes and skills in planning, implementing, administering, regulating, and assessing vocational education in corrections; (2) provide a forum for the exchange of information about problems, programs, ideas, and activities; (3) facilitate the dissemination and use of products, practices, and services; (4) provide information about new vocational education legislation and its ramifications for vocational education in corrections; and (5) stimulate and increase interagency cooperation. The body of the report is comprised of twenty-eight speeches which are grouped into the following nine sections: (1) setting the stage (includes an address by Clairborne Pell, followed by questions and answers); (2) the 1976 Education Act and vocational education in corrections; (3) funding and delivering vocational education in corrections; (4) information retrieval and future technology for vocational education in corrections; (5) planning, accountability, and standards for vocational education in corrections; (6) job market information and offender placement; (7) offender needs and interests; (8) personnel development; and (9) interagency cooperation. (BL)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from

ED147475

Leadership Training Series No. 53

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

May 16-18, 1977, Houston, Texas

Improving the Quality and Quantity of Vocational Education in Corrections

Compiled and Edited

by

F. Patrick Cronin
Mark Newton

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 013 242

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

June 1977

The material in this publication was funded by an Education Professional Development Act (EPDA), Part F, Section 553 Grant, administered through the Vocational Education Personnel Development Division, BOAE/USOE, Region V Office, USOE, and the Division of Vocational Education of the Ohio State Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view do not, therefore, necessarily represent official BOAE, USOE, or State of Ohio position or policy.

Duane Nielsen, Chief
Vocational Education Personnel Development
BOAE/USOE
Washington, DC

Darrell L. Parks, Project Monitor
Division of Vocational Education
Ohio State Department of Education
Columbus, Ohio

Daryl Nichols, Program Specialist
Vocational and Technical Education
United States Office of Education
Region V, Chicago, Illinois

THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The Center for Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

FOREWORD

The National Conference on Vocational Education in Corrections was a historic occasion. The diversity of participants, the wide range of commitments, both by individuals and organizations, spoke well for its success. It also said something of the significance of our mission—to improve the quality and quantity of vocational education in corrections. Indeed, the diversity of perspective reflected a creative and hybrid vigor.

A review of the vocational education amendments and the keynote address by Senator Claiborne Pell provided convincing evidence to participants of the emergence of a concern for a national policy or posture with respect to corrections. Vocational education is perhaps the first of a number of bills that might address the correction's population. Hopefully, a coherent policy will emerge in the future and tie together the various elements of vocational education, CETA, elementary and secondary education, and other bills.

A vehicle now exists (the comprehensive planning provision of the Education Amendments of 1976) for representation by corrections on state and national vocational education advisory councils. The implication is one of full participation and the emphasis is on data-based planning and decision making. Certainly we can now begin to move toward improving the quality and quantity of vocational education in corrections.

Indeed there is a wide range of policy and program issues. Obviously we are dealing with multidelivery systems. Education is but one element of the multifaceted solution.

While vocational education recognizes and accepts the challenge inherent in the new legislative provision and emphasis, it too is torn between the needs of the preventative dimension (which can provide programs for mainstreaming people and hopefully insure economic placement toward the end that they are not a part of the criminal justice system), and the need to work on the correctional side. Fiscal resources, however, are limited. Therefore, the persuasiveness and leadership of persons like Senator Claiborne Pell is vital.

The National Conference emphasized the need for better facts and figures concerning those elements of programs that are successful with various kinds of individuals; better data on recidivism; better data on follow-up; better data all around. Sound data bases could well lead to a research and development agenda. Such an agenda could provide mechanisms for the development and testing of useful innovations.

As professionals concerned not only with education in corrections, but also other areas of public policy, we need to begin to seriously address the preventative dimension.

The Center for Vocational Education stands firmly committed to working and expanding its efforts in the areas of corrections and criminal preventation. This National Conference facilitated The Center's and nation's development of a sharpened sense of purpose, a better feel for successful interventions, and an agenda of what research and development activities are needed. This, in part, was the result of a significant amount of interagency cooperation—something of which we need a great deal more.

The Center remains concerned about the exchange of information on problems, programs, and ideas. It is concerned about providing decision makers with good information that will facilitate planning, implementing, administering, regulating, and assessing vocational education in corrections. We want to facilitate the dissemination of products that have been produced through technical assistance and we want to stimulate more interagency cooperation.

The National Conference was outcome oriented. It featured a cadre of nationally recognized leaders who functioned as both presenters and resource persons. Their major contributions are contained within this document.

Special recognition is due F. Patrick Cronin, personnel development specialist, for his efforts in directing the seminar. Additional appreciation is extended to Charles Whitson, personnel development specialist, and Lorraine Furtado, personnel development specialist who co-coordinated the conference. Graduate research associates, Rosetta Gooden, Mark Newton, Robert Wheatley, and project secretary, Dorothy Cameron provided much assistance prior to and throughout the conference. Further, the assistance of the National Planning Committee is gratefully acknowledged as are the Vocational Education Personnel Development Division, BOAE/USOE, Region V, USOE, and the Ohio Division of Vocational Education.

I would be remiss if the fine hospitality, technical, and support services provided by the Texas Education Agency in general and the Windham School District in particular were not acknowledged. Their efforts will long be remembered by all who participated in a most successful endeavor.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The Center for Vocational Education

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

The National Conference on Vocational Education in Corrections was the third component of a three-phase project conducted by The Center for Vocational Education. The overall project was funded by an EPDA, Part F, Section 553 Grant and administered through the Vocational Education Personnel Development Division, Bureau of Adult Education, United States Office of Education, Region V, and the Ohio Division of Vocational Education.

Phase I of the project included a workshop for selected states and was conducted November 14-16, 1976 at The Center for Vocational Education. The purpose of the workshop was to assist leaders in both vocational education and corrections to cooperatively plan improved vocational education programs for offenders. Participant states included: Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Phase II of the project involved technical assistance services. Special on-site attention was given to meeting correctional education needs in those states that participated in Phase I.

Phase III was the National Conference on Vocational Education in Corrections. It resulted, in great part, from significant efforts expended by the national conference planning committee. Participation was encouraged at all levels in both the fields of vocational education and corrections. That which was learned and developed during Phases I and II was shared with the participants attending the National Conference.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

Purpose

To disseminate, on a nationwide basis, practical information about and alternative solutions to complex problems facing those concerned with the quality and quantity of vocational education in corrections.

Objectives

1. To provide decision makers with information designed to foster the continued development of essential attitudes and skills in planning, implementing, administering, regulating and assessing vocational education in corrections.
2. To provide a forum for the exchange of information about problems, programs, ideas, and activities in vocational education in corrections.
3. To facilitate the dissemination and use of products, practices and services related to vocational education in corrections developed through technical assistance efforts in selected states.
4. To provide information about new vocational education legislation and its ramifications for vocational education in corrections.
5. To stimulate and increase interagency cooperation for improving vocational education in corrections.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

John W. Braithwaite
Deputy Commissioner, Inmate Programs
Canadian Penitentiary Service
340 Laurier Avenue, West
Ottawa, Ontario KIA 0P9

Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director
American Vocational Association
1510 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Sherman Day, Director
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Grady Decell, Director
South Carolina Dept. of Youth Services
and President, National Association of State
Juvenile Delinquency Program Administrators
1720 Shivers Road
P. O. Box 3188
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

W. J. Estelle, Director
Texas Department of Corrections
Box 99
Huntsville, Texas 77340

Ruth M. Glick, Chief
Correctional Planning
California Department of Corrections
714 P Street
Sacramento, California

Eugene Lehrmann, State Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Sylvia G. McCollum
Education Administrator
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Daryl Nichols
Education Specialist
Vocational Technical Education
Department of HEW, Region V
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Ex Officio

Nick Pappas, Director
Special Programs Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Admin.
633 Indiana Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530

Darrell Parks
Assistant Director
Division of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
65 S. Front Street, Room 907
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Ex-Officio

Reginald Petty
Executive Director
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
425 - 13th Street, N.W., Suite 412
Washington, D.C. 20004

Amos E. Reed
Deputy Secretary
Department of Offender Rehabilitation
1311 Winewood Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Byrl Shoemaker
State Director
Division of Vocational Education
Department of Education
State of Ohio
65 S. Front Street, Room 612
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Jack Solomon, President
Correctional Education Association
P. O. Box 20461
Chicago, Illinois 60620

Ronald C. Tarlaian
Program Specialist
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
ROB No. 3, Room 5640
7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
Ex-Officio

Anthony P. Travisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association
4321 Hartwick Road, Suite L208
College Park, Maryland 26740

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iii

Historical Perspectives v

Purpose and Objectives of the National Conference on Vocational Education in Corrections vii

National Conference Planning Committee viii

SECTION ONE: Setting the Stage 1

Education and Prisons
The Honorable Claiborne Pell 3

Questions and Answers/Education and Prisons
Conference Participants and The Honorable Claiborne Pell 7

Planning and Accountability for Vocational Education in Corrections
Daniel B. Dunham 13

The Prognosis for Vocational Education in Corrections
Byrl Shoemaker 21

SECTION TWO: The 1976 Education Act and Vocational Education in Corrections 25

Interagency Cooperation to Improve Vocational Education for Offenders
LeRoy A. Cornelsen 27

Implications of the 1976 Education Act for Women's Equity in Corrections
Eileen Lehman 31

Vocational Education for Women in Correctional Institutions
Ruth M. Glick 37

How Can Corrections Use Vocational Advisory Committees
Lowell A. Burkett 39

SECTION THREE: Funding and Delivering Vocational Education in Corrections 45

Funding and Administration Problems and Their Relationship to Other Issues in Correctional Vocational Education
Raymond Bell 47

The Funding of Vocational Education Programs for Offenders Who Experience the Correctional Process
F. Patrick Cronin 55

Approaches for Delivering Vocational Education in Corrections
Mary Ann Evan, Joan Polk, Larry Salmony 65

SECTION FOUR: Information Retrieval and Future Technology for Vocational Education in Corrections 81

Information Retrieval Systems: Who Needs Them?
Paul E. Schroeder 83

The Future of Technology for Correctional Vocational Education
Kenneth A. Polcyn 97

SECTION FIVE: Planning, Accountability, and Standards for Vocational Education in Corrections 109

Research Approaches to Planning and Accountability for Vocational Education in Corrections: The Systems Approach
Ronald J. Waldron 111

Status of Standards Development by the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections
Jack Heard 115

SECTION SIX: Job Market Information and Offender Placement 119

Job Market Information
Brian Richey 121

A Model for Job Development and Community Awareness for Hiring the Ex-Offender
Edward Gallagher 125

Offender Job Placement
John Nunnery 129

SECTION SEVEN: Offender Needs and Interests 135

Wisconsin's Mutual Agreement Program
Russel Leik 137

What Procedures are Available to Assess and Consider the Vocational Education Needs of Adult Offenders
T. P. Jones 143

Vocational Needs and Interests of Juvenile Offenders
Grady A. Decell 149
Trumbull Kelly, Mark Weideranders 153
Christ L. George 159

Offender Needs in Short-Term Institutions: New York City Department of Correction
Alphonso K. Ford 163

Offender Needs in Short-Term Institutions
Ernestine H. Schnuelle 169

Vocational Education Needs of Offenders in Short-Term Institutions
Bill Broome 173

SECTION EIGHT: Personnel Development 183

Personnel Development
Clarence Collier 185
Ted Shannon 189

Success and the Vocational Educator
Karl Davidson 193

SECTION NINE: Interagency Cooperation 197

Interagency Cooperation
Eugene Lehrmann 199

Interagency Cooperation in the Future
Robert E. Rodli 205

APPENDIX 209

Exhibit A: Conference Agenda 211

Exhibit B: Conference Presenters and Participants 223

SECTION ONE:

SETTING THE STAGE

- Education and Prisons
- Questions and Answers/Education and Prisons
- Planning and Accountability for Vocational Education in Corrections
- The Prognosis for Vocational Education in Corrections

EDUCATION AND PRISONS

by Hon. Claiborne Pell*

My present interest in the role that education can play in our prisons stems from a vocational education hearing I conducted two years ago. At that time the Senate was considering the Vocational Education Act and, pursuing the broad spectrum of education, I asked one witness what was being done to educate prisoners in his state.

He really did not know what programs there were at all.

Later I looked into the matter further and found that there was no national effort being made to provide educational opportunities to prisoners. That is so even though the lack of education is one of the disadvantages that leads to crime. What I saw then was a very unhopeful picture. The prison system as a whole, I found, was the guardian of one of the least recognized special populations. Prison programs are an unwanted expense and they are generally neglected. More than that, this uncaring and neglect has evidently reached down to the prison population and intensified the vicious circle of neglect and malcontent that can make our prisons schools of crime and not the centers of correction and rehabilitation that they should be.

This is important to me because I see that a large population is passing through our society having never seen the advantage that a good education can bring. This is particularly obvious since the group I have in mind, prisoners, is a group that is a natural target for our efforts. The vast majority of education legislation we consider each year is aimed at special needs groups. These are the poor, the handicapped, the rural isolated, and many others with special disadvantages. Our work then is to bring these people back into the system and, as best we can, to give them an equal opportunity to enjoy life, to start a career, and to find hope.

We may have twice as far to go in dealing with prisoners as with normal students, but we must begin. It is shocking to me that the 280,000 men and women in our prison system, and the 250,000 in our jails have been so completely sealed off from the rest of society; denied not only the ability to work at a fair wage, to study or to train, but they are, on the whole, denied almost every opportunity of participating in everyday life.

I don't want to make any grand pronouncements about prisons. It does not take an expert, though, to see that our system has become unworkable; that too often it breeds crime, and that it does nothing to lower our rate of incarceration. I was alarmed to learn that between 215 and 220 per 100,000 citizens are in jail in America. Hard figures are difficult to obtain but this is one of the highest rates in the world.

---

*The Honorable Claiborne Pell is a United States Senator from Rhode Island. He is Chairman of the Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee, and Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

I read a report recently which compared the rate of incarceration in the United States with several European and Scandanavian countries. In Sweden, for instance, the incarceration rate is 32 persons per 100,000. In Denmark the rate is 28 per 100,000; and in the Netherlands it's 18 per 100,000. That's 1/12 of the figure in the United States.

There are many reasons for this wide discrepancy between us and so many other nations. America has a long tradition of violence. We also treat prisoners as non-citizens which worsens the ill feelings they hold about society. There are many additional factors, the effect of television on children might be one, but I only want to make the point that we shall only rehabilitate criminals when we learn to bring them back into society and not just shut them out.

It is my belief that education can be and should be one of the prime ingredients in this effort. My proposal is that we aggressively move to improve the quantity and quality of educational opportunities for all prisoners. This won't do everything, but it is a start. I want then, to see a new character of education in our prisons. A character that will reflect the evolving and increasingly complex nature of the society for which prisoners must be prepared.

Today, one out of ten workers has graduated from college. In twenty years one out of five will have graduated and two out of five will have had at least one year in higher education. This trend has come about not only because we support higher education, but because our country is growing increasingly complex and the jobs of the future will demand entirely new skills.

It's hard enough for a regular worker to get a job in these times, but that is the prospect we face. In the midst of all this change though, and as times grow more and more confusing, our prisons stand fixed and unchanging. Inmates are held in a type of suspended animation really, and when they are released they face a world that has changed entirely and for which they are entirely unprepared.

My hope then, for our work and for these men, is that we can combine vocational study with some study in academics. I'd also like to see more guidance, counseling, and placement services. With this aid prisoners will be more able to find a place on the outside, and so be less of a burden on society. Considering the pace of life today this is a minimal effort. The alternative to this action is to continue ignoring these men and women which will only further alienate them and probably contribute to the current horrendous rate of recidivism.

Though there has not been much action in prison reform in the past few years, a few steps have been taken. Your center made a commitment in 1974, far ahead of most of the thinking in the field. The idea then was to bring together leaders from many fields, and as we look about this room we see that is exactly what has been done. It is a good start.

This is also an interesting parallel to what we did in our reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act last year. We found that many states ran vocational programs without being concerned about the integration of these courses into the community and the job market. Typically, students would learn a specific skill in school and then discover, after graduation, that there was no need for that skill among the employers in the area. Sometimes, schools have trained students to perform jobs that are obsolete entirely. My favorite example of this is with a certain prison work program that teaches men to stamp license plates. Of course the only place where they could perform that job was in jail, so when those men were released they had no job skills that were useful outside the prison walls. That's a joke in the telling but it's also true, and if we look at the problem seriously it's almost a tragedy.

What is needed to provide effective prison education programs then is an integration of prison services with other human resource programs in each state and throughout the range of federal programs. I can see the immediate benefits that schools can provide, but on the longer range we need to tie in with community guidance and counseling services. The Public Health Service could be of help here. Then there is the importance of finding work for ex-offenders. I would hope that unions and veteran's organizations would throw their weight in our behalf. Eventually, then, we might find our way on to Public Works and Comprehensive Employment and Training Act programs.

That is a long way in the future, so for now we will have to work by ourselves and with the help of a very few laws. You are all aware of the move I made last year to put prison education in the scheme of things. That was just a small part of my work with the Vocational Education Amendments. As I said, my purpose was to open vocational education to its full responsibilities and potential. Happily, I also find that we had not only opened the doors of vocational education, but that we had opened doors for all the special groups we mentioned in the law. That was a nice benefit to our work. Since that time, I have had conversations with educators and with people in industry who have mentioned the new opportunities that have opened to them since that law was passed. So I think the strategy of opening up the field is good.

I hope our concern for the helping of the small man will always be as strong.

Woodrow Wilson spoke about the common man when he said, "When I look back on the process of history, when I survey the genesis of America, then I see this written over every page: that nations are renewed from the bottom, not from the top; that the genius which springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the youth and energy of the people."

I would like to see us keep that spirit, and I would like to see the educational establishment reach out to prisoners just as we have seen schools and universities reach out to the handicapped and to all minorities.

In the past few years education has had to answer this challenge and it has done so with some real inventiveness and success. Schools have learned to serve broader populations, adult illiterates for example, and educators have stressed service to the community as they never have before.

What this should mean to you is that prisoners should be one of the next groups to come under educational law. There is really a flood tide now which has carried all the special needs groups into educational programs. You should be no exception, and I will work to see that prisoners get an opportunity for a full education which I think should be theirs by right.

We are just learning now that the price we must pay for providing equal access of this type and to these needy populations is very high. We have gone on for years, largely ignoring the needs of many isolated groups, so now we are reconsidering what we have done. And that change of mind, that change of policy, has brought a great number of complications.

In spite of all those new burdens though, and in spite of any economic worries, we will go ahead. We will not slow down on our drive to offer the benefits of a good education to every student, and I hope you will join us in this work. If we can keep up the effort on the federal level, and I think we can, then you can throw your lot in with us; join our programs, take advantage of what funding will come, and build up your own effort.

This is how I would like to see the role of education expanded. Not only in regard to prisons, but in every way I would like to see our nation's schools and universities take a full part in society. All too often the world of education is not relevant to the world of work. So often educators are removed from the real world, too elitist, locked in the ivory tower. Now there is a change coming and as educators reach out to renew their contact with the working world you can take advantage.

In the end education will be stronger, and our poor and disadvantaged will be stronger also. We will have provided that hope which a new start, a fair chance, and an equal opportunity can bring.

As Thomas Wolfe said, "To every man his chance. To every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity. To every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and become whatever his manhood and vision can contribute to make."

In spite of the difficulties education has, and in spite of the difficulties in corrections work, and in reform, I look forward to our working together.

We will make a difference.

We will give those whom we work for that hope, and a chance for betterment.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: EDUCATION AND PRISONS

Conference Participants and The Honorable Claiborne Pell

Question: Senator Pell, you commented about unnecessary prison construction in your remarks. Do I take this as a call for a moratorium on prison construction?

Answer: In the first place we have to deal with conditions in the imperfect state of affairs in which they are in. The fact is that many of our present facilities are barbaric or are obsolete. So, no, I am not calling for a moratorium on prison construction. I frankly think the present ones should be replaced if nothing else.

Question: Given the high unemployment in scores of cities across the country, particularly among the young, the most vulnerable, and knowing the resistence of the American public to give preference to people with prison records jobs, are you also calling for guaranteed full time employment for all prison releasees?

Answer: If you want to probe into the depth of my liberal soul, I would say that I do think that government has an obligation to be the employer of last recourse to all individuals. I hate to see us get down the road that far because of the load on the taxpayers. If I were pressed hard however, I would say that government has a responsibility to find employment one way or another for anyone who wants to find a job no matter if he has a prison record or not. That is my personal view; whether we will get there in my lifetime, I do not know.

Question: Regardless of the efforts that might be made in terms of preparing people for employment, our recently elected president, although he ran on a platform of full employment, has seen it as a belated issue to be addressed. What do you see is our ability for getting him to press for full employment because so many of our youth and others fall into crime because they lack employment?

Answer: In the first place, I do not shy away from the President's hope of a balanced budget, because from an economic viewpoint, the worst problem we face is inflation—if for no other reason than for what it means to the economy—not only to jobs, to savings, and to other areas. What it means, is that once we realize that we are going to accept a 5 percent or 8 percent rate of inflation each year, why would anybody in their right mind want to buy a bond or a fixed income security. You will then move out of the capital building process a whole section of our capital which will slow the country down. I do have that feeling and I would like to see something done to stop inflation. Now whether that means a balanced budget, whether there is another way of doing it, I do not know, but I think it is an important objective and I would agree with President Carter on that. As far as the question goes as to whether we will see an effort made to provide more employment opportunities, I think we will, in the sense that I would hope that we could move, if not into a national-service type of employment, into some kind of program that would employ people who seek jobs. Whether we will find that happening in the next two years is a basic question. I would like to see it happen, but I think it is unlikely.

Question: Senator Pell, would you care to comment on the congressional intent behind the pilot programs which are presently in operation in Texas and Georgia that give a man $70 to $80 per week for a period of time after release to see what will be the affect on recidivism? It seems a waste of money to pay a man to stay out of jail. It seems to me it would be more effective to give that money to state correctional or vocational facilities to provide necessary skills so one would have a way to earn an income.

Answer: I am not familiar with the program. Obviously it makes more sense to give a man a fish-hook and a fishing rod than to give him a supply of fish. And obviously it makes more sense to educate a person, or to train a person, to get a job than to train him to do nothing. If you pay him to do nothing, his opportunity to try and increase his standard of living through crime would be increased, I would think. Part of his problem is one that you point out, the economic circumstances. Another part of his problem is one of no other way of occupying one's time. That is why education has two facets as well; to help you in your leisure. I would like to see the emphasis made on the education. Remember I am speaking here as a broad generalist with responsibility for oversight over all education, not in the specifics of it as much as I would like to be when talking with all of you.

Question: What is the future of set-aside funds for correctional education?

Answer: I don't know the answer to that. Personally, I would find myself sympathetic, but I would have to wait until the proposal come foreward.

Question: Senator, going back to your statement about teaching people things instead of giving them things and your point that to pay them to do nothing is hardly worthwhile, I would like to refer back to a recent G.A.O. study that compared public service employment investment, training investment, and unemployment compensation. In the comparisons, preparing people to do something came out significantly ahead. Looking now to the coming period of time, what will be the position of the committee relative to CETA and the Youth Employment Act as they look at new legislation given this new research of the relationship between public service employment, training investment and unemployment compensation? What will be the position of Congress?

Answer: Well, CETA and youth employment came before subcommittees of which I am not the chairman, but in general, if the facts are made available, and this is where the administration can help us because they have some of the responsibility in this regard, I think you will find them cranked into the legislation. Sometimes you have a body of facts out here and the Congress there and the interchange is not as close as it should be. This is one of the purposes which I hope comes out of this conference. My point is that there are many reports out on that subject, on CETA and employment, and I'm not sure that one more report will make that much of an impression on Congress.

It would take much more than one study. It would take the voice of people like you to sing the song so it would be heard.

Question: Senator, how do we go about getting our song sung to the public and getting the ear and support of officials like you who make policy decisions?

Answer: Well, one way is through good public relations. You must make the American public realize that it costs less to send a youngster to an institution of higher education than it does to an institution of crime education, which is what prison is. If this can be done, the rest of your job will be relatively simple. But this song is not being sung enough and your spokesmen have not gotten it across. I think you need some kind of professional public relations. I think you should approach your own Members of Congress with this story so that they are sympathetic. But I think this is the only way it can be done.

Think of it in terms of politics. You are trying to change votes. You are trying to change thoughts. And the public is very turned off on crime and prisoners now. All they want is the minimum expense of building a newer, bigger, stronger and tougher jails. You have got to show them that it's cheaper to have fewer people in jail. You may find a young congressman who wants to make this his mission. A young senator could go a long way with it in ten years.

Question: Is it the lack of public relations, then, that leads to the absence of sympathy for the incarcerated as a special needs population?

Answer: I think so. I think people just don't think about the incarcerated as being a special needs population. It is not in people's minds.

Question: Would it be possible to call attention to this population and to make some of that money earmarked for special populations available for the incarcerated?

Answer: It should be. You must recognize that you are entering into competition. Remember there are even more handicapped children. The parents of the handicapped children would rather see more money earmarked for handicapped children than for the prison population. What is necessary is just to keep getting that thought across. Look up the various members of Congress who are on the education subcommittee and the full committee. See if any of them come from states that are represented here in this room. Go after those people. The executive branch can also do more in this regard, I think.

Question: Senator, in the future regarding the legislation, assuming that we were not able to get an act together relative to public rleations, do you see new omnibus legislation with regard to education in corrections coming forward or do you see forces pecking away at the issue by adding dimensions to other laws as they come out. Which is your direction?

Answer: Well, if I had just been elected to Congress, I might make this a cause. Of course now, I have so many responsibilities, as chairman of several different subcommittees, there is an awful lot to do. I'll be doing my best to peck away at it during the next few years.

I will peck away at it, I give you my assurance of that. But it would be helpful to me if there were somebody who could really try to put together a whole comprehensive bill of that sort.

Question: Is it legal or illegal to discriminate against a human being in employment because he has a record? We talk about education, but what about putting that education to use, if they are discriminated against in employment?

Answer: That is a tremendous problem and I don't have the answer to it. I'd need a lawyer to give me the legal aspects. I don't think it's illegal and I am sure you could pass a law which would say it would be illegal. But I agree with you, it is a fact. Again it is a question of public impact and example. An example would be President Carter in hiring a convicted muderess as a nurse for his child. This is a good example but not one which too many of us would have the courage to emulate. I am a generalist in this regard myself, and I need to be educated. I think I would not have had the gumption to do that. I should, I admit. I admire President Carter for doing it. Perhaps stuffy fellows like myself could be changed, and should be.

Question: It seems to me that there are a lot of people who go through the criminal justice system that shouldn't have in the first place. By the time the correctional people get them, they are so turned off they won't talk to their own mother, much less corrections people. Is anybody in Congress taking a look at the criminal justice system in the United States in order to solve that problem? Maybe we could stop a lot of people from going to prison before they even get there.

Answer: Well, I think the new bill, S-1, that Kennedy and McClellan have agreed on goes some way in this direction. For instance, I think you can have up to an ounce of marijuana and it is not a felony. This reduces the penalty for victimless crime. I think many of our people who are in jail for victimless crimes really shouldn't be there. I would hope we could move in that direction. In answer to your question, Congress is a big body, 550 people. I can give you the answer in the Senate, I know of nobody making a cause of it. About the House, I do not know.

Question: Senator, this is as much a remark as it is a question. The statistics that we need to use more loudly and clearly is the fact that for those people who complete vocational education, the unemployment rate is about half of what it is for youth unemployment in the band of those aged 16-25. We know that many of our unemployed young people in the streets and in our heavily populated cities in particular turn to crime as an alternative to employment. I think partly what is being said is that we have a good education program. We are going to put part of corrections out of business by never having the youth there in the first place if we train them well, get them jobs and keep them off the streets. One of the issues, though, recognizing your important role in the Senate and your influence on those making decisions about appropriations is that we can hardly continue pecking away and doing all of these things unless we get a bit more money. I hope you will strive to that end.

Answer: Remember, I am the authorizing fellow and I provide the ceiling, but not the floor. Rarely are my ceilings anywhere near reached by the floor. That happens in all my legislation. You have my assurance that I believe, as I said in my speech today. I really got interested in this subject completely by myself, and I think the fact that we have those amendments in the Vocational Education Act is far more accidental than anybody in this room realizes. We just got interested in it ourselves. I will continue pursuing this, but we need help from other members of Congress and also from the public. Basically members of Congress have as their priority consideration, their re-election, and in order for that to happen, there has to be general support for their efforts. You can stretch your range and leave your constituents once or twice, but you don't leave them too far. If you start making a cause of better education for convicts, your opponent can turn that around. You have to be very sure of your facts and be very dedicated to do it. You can get away with it in one or two cases, but you can't do it too often. I thought this out very carefully in connection with the Viet Nam war, where I broke with President Johnson in 1966. I knew I could only afford one break with public opinion. My state was very hawkish at that time. You do need to have two or three young members of Congress who really believe in it and have pretty sure districts to do it. It's best to find somebody with a sure district so he can be more independent.

PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS: THE CORRECTIONS CONNECTION

by Daniel B. Dunham*

I wish to share with you some views regarding the connection that must be made in a continuing and strengthened way between vocational education and the various correctional education systems that operate throughout our several states. I prefer to call this the "corrections connection" and will attempt through the process of sharing with you these remarks to demonstrate points of contact which ought to be made between existing and planned system of vocational education delivery and the needs of clients of adult correctional institutions.

There are numerous requirements, citations, and provisions within the new vocational education legislation (Title II, P.L. 94-482) for supporting and servicing the needs of adult corrections clients through vocational and technical education. I will not go into detail with regard to specific citations of law or rules and regulations, but will rather attempt to provide an overview of my sense of the potentials within this legislation for establishing a basis for making the "corrections connection."

The focus of P.L. 94-482 is clearly on broadened educational planning and program improvement. The extent to which the actual operation and delivery of educational services will be the prerogative of education outside correctional institutions is a variable that will run a wide range of extremes from state-to-state and perhaps from institution-to-institution. Thus, I think it is critical that we begin by focusing on planning and improvement of educational programs and services which are highly visible and usable within the correctional setting. It is clear to me also that the delivery of these educational services, that is, instructional programs, equipment and facilities, materials and supplies, the training of teachers, the provision of guidance services and the broad range of other necessary educational support systems will essentially be the responsibility of correctional institutions. This is not to say that educaton as an entity (that is, a state education department, a division of vocational technical education, an adult general or basic education effort or any one of a variety of other portions of educational programming and delivery) may not become involved in the actual delivery of services. In those states where separate school districts for correctional clients exist, as well as in those states where much of the responsibility for carrying out instructional programs has been given over to the educational system within the state or local region, there is clearly a requirement that educators become deeply involved in the practice of education within the corrections setting. However, my present information indicates that by and large, the actual delivery of instructional programs will remain a function of the correctional institutions. This provides both promise and certainly surfaces problems.

In Maryland, the mandate for planning and development is clearly set forth in a 1976 state law which established an "Education Coordinating Council on Correctional Institutions." This council includes the State Superintendent of Schools, who is appointed by the law to be the chairman of the council; the Commissioner of the State Department of Correction; the Executive Director of the State Board for Community Colleges; a member representing the public (appointed by the Governor); the Superintendent of a school district having a correctional institution in its boundaries appointed by the State Superintendent of Schools.

---

*Daniel B. Dunham is Assistant Superintendent of Vocational-Technical Education, Maryland State Department of Education.

In Maryland, this council has held an organizational meeting and has delineated certain tasks for staff of the Department of Education to carry out in preparation for subsequent meetings to take place before the end of the fiscal year. An essential requirement of the state law establishing this council is that the council report to the Maryland General Assembly on its activities and plans before June 30, 1977. As executive secretary to the council, I can assure you that we intend to carry out that charge. It has become a major task for the Department of Education and specifically for the Division of Vocational Technical Education.

The council is basing some of its preliminary work on the results of a short-term study conducted by Charles Whitson of The Center for Vocational Education at The Ohio State University. The report, entitled "The Maryland Model," lays out certain parameters within which the council may undertake its planning and development work. It calls for a series of task forces to deal with some eighteen elements found to be necessary in the State of Maryland for planning and developing a comprehensive educational system. While the study was undertaken as a joint effort of the Division of Vocational-Technical Education and the Maryland State Department of Correction, it does not focus essentially on vocational education as the only portion of a delivery system. Rather, it touches base with all existing systems within the Maryland correctional system and deals with the various needs and levels of individual clients as well as with available opportunities within that system.

There are many in the discussions we have had so far, however, who feel that the role of vocational education in dealing with the corrections connection (that is the connection between education and correctional client needs) ought to be a primary and viable one. It almost goes without saying that vocational education certainly provides the wide range of instructional opportunities—or should provide such a range—that will meet the needs of a large majority of the adult clients presently resident in the adult correctional institutions in our state. Suffice to say that the Maryland model project, and other developments that have ensued since its completion late last fall, have provided a reasonably sound base from which the Education Coordinating Council on Correctional Institutions will move as it approaches its roles for planning, development and projecting of needs, problems and resolutions over the next three to five years.

Today I would like to focus, however, most specifically on the implications of Public Law 94-482 as it relates to "The Corrections Connection."

There are ten items that seem to me to be the most important issues surfaced in Public Law 94-482 which affect the broad reach of educational programs that can be made available to the clients of correctional institutions. These implications are not specific to instruction, however, but require some foresight and visibility as they become placed in a priority order. What I'm going to suggest to you is in my priority order. It may be different for each of you but essentially these are the items which I feel we must look at first in order to establish a basis for the "Corrections Connection."

1 Accountability

Public Law 94-482 is very thorough and specific throughout all of its parts and subparts on to the issue of accountability. This issue cannot be overstated. It is likely that it will be underdeveloped initially. If it is, we are going to have a heavy price to pay. When we are talking about education in correctional institutions, it becomes an even more critical issue. I am personally welcoming the accountability dimension and the degrees of enforcement, and enabling, that appear to come with it under this new piece of legislation. I think we are being asked, finally and perhaps for the first time, to specifically account for what we have been doing in vocational education in the public domain. As we approach the correctional issue as a "first time" first issue for many of us, it is essential that we begin from a conceptual framework that says that accountability is a key issue and one with which we must deal up front, on top of the table, first hand, and load the system from the front end with the idea of accountability wrapped around it.

The series of events which lead us to accountability certainly begin with assessment or preliminary evaluation and lead through planning, design, development, trial and test, monitoring, review, assessment of the implementation and finally feeding back to evaluation. That is all very easy to say; it is not simple to put together. Accountability is a continuous process which ultimately results at various points in time in the cycle in having firm data, and specific outcomes measured against known performance standards that tell us whether or not we got the job done. I think it is clearly the most important issue in making the "Corrections Connection"—that is—that we begin now to face up to the fact that we are going to be held accountable for what we do, and not deal with "gray mush" ideas, plans and schemes. We must set forth specifically what we expect to accomplish in making the "Corrections Connection" between vocational education delivery systems and the needs of adult clients in correctional institutions; set goals, objectives and delineate activities with resources assigned to those activities based on preassessment, planning and on through development and implementation, affected by monitoring, reviewing and assessing, with hard-headed evaluation of outcomes against what we said we would do. Again, that sounds simple. It is not. It is essential. It must be done.

2. Vocational Guidance

There is perhaps no more viable and useful issue within the new federal legislation for vocational education than the opportunities to expand services in the area of vocational guidance and support systems for people of all ages, natures and locations. Within the correctional institutional setting we have had a great paucity of relevant up-to-date job opportunity information to use in the process of guiding potential students into the correct training programs. While we know that there is no specific evidence in the research to indicate a high degree of correlation between training in the vocational domain and recidivism, we do know that a person given good information is going to be able to make better choices. And based on making better choices he or she ought to be able to make better decisions in both the short and long run.

We are sadly lacking in comprehensive broad-based vocational guidance support systems in any area of vocational education, let alone in the corrections education area. There is perhaps no better place than in our correctional institutions to identify some very specific needs for vocational guidance services and to implement some pilot ideas and models to test those ideas to a point of accountability.

Suffice to say that vocational guidance will be a primary issue as far as the Maryland effort is concerned. We will look to computerized occupational information systems, resource centers within institutions providing guidance materials, service, and support and a linkage system which will bring information from the real world of work into direct contact with the decision-making client of the correctional system.

3 Instructional Programs

Here again we are grossly underdeveloped in the correctional setting. We have had a tendency to isolate instructional programs in the vocational education domain to a shop-oriented situation with a heavy expenditure of funds and with very low enrollments. The evidence resulting from research indicates that many of these programs are stereotyped to job area, are not adequately supported with facilities, supplies and materials, and are often wanting for contemporary instructor capacity. The instructional programs component of the connections to be made in the correctional area is clearly the most critical as far as day-to-day operation is concerned. We must have a knowledge and information base which says that we are preparing people for employment; not for unemployment. They must have a reasonable expectation of securing a job after going through a period of training. Likewise, the programs must be flexible in nature, scope and length. Some of our clients are only in an institution which has such facilities for a very few months. They are in transition. We must have high impact, short turn-around time training programs which will, in fact, capacitate an individual to either take that next step of getting a job or going on to additional programming.

At this point, I think the articulation issue surfaces. That is to say that a person in the institutional training program ought to be able to access continuing education in a similar or related program once released. I like to deal with the idea of the community college for example, as an "educational half-way house." I think if we can design a competency-based, individualized instructional program in the several vocational domains, we will be able to affect good articulation between institutional programs and community-based programs. This is a high priority issue as far as I am concerned and must be dealt with through careful planning, development and implementation.

The quantity of programs may not be nearly so important as the numbers of persons enrolled in them. Here again, the guidance system has a lot to say about where the people are coming from and where they're going.

4 Special Needs Populations

It may be a gross oversimplification to say that all clients of correctional institutions fall into the category of "disadvantaged." I think we must take a good hard look at the disadvantaged populations within our institutions and identify ways in which those particular sources of support may be used to assist them in achieving a degree of success in their regular program of instruction in the vocational education areas. However, I do not feel that we should assume that all of them are disadvantaged. Rather, we need to carefully evaluate their aptitudes, interests and abilities, their levels of knowledge and skill and, with the support of a good vocational guidance system, assure their placement in a correct and proper instructional program within the institutional setting. Let me digress for a moment to say that I don't believe all of the schooling of the vocational nature in corrections need go on within the walls of an institution. We ought also to be looking into more community-based, partial time-release programs which can affect the same outcomes as we might achieve inter-institutionally.

Back to the point. The area of disadvantaged within vocational education programming is intended to modify programs so those who are disadvantaged educationally, academically, or sociologically can achieve a degree of success in a regular program. The same thing applies to those who are handicapped. I think we've done a fairly sad job of really identifying these needs. We must establish some evaluation centers in our institutions, or at least two or three in the state where we can move people for assessment, so that we can really find out what their skills, capacities, and needs are. Let me suggest that much of this might be done in existing centers in public schools. I think we need to look hard at the broader use of our existing resources and not spend all of our time talking only about the creation of new monuments to education in the corrections setting.

5. Sex Bias

The important thing to remember in this area is that it is a sex issue; not a female issue alone. Fortunately the smallest population of our correctional institutions are female. However, there are as many biases for males with regard to occupation as there are for females. Where we have concentrated populations of less than well-educated males, it seems important to me that we take advantage of the opportunity, through vocational guidance systems and other methods that are available to us, to assure that we are eliminating the bias of sex from our job information and training programs. There may be a great deal more promise in this area in the correctional institutions than we are guessing at this time. It is an undeveloped issue at this point, but one on which we could do very well to spend a good bit of time. Again, with a controlled population, we might be able to do some exciting things that will positively affect not only the need of the corrections population, but also the needs of students in the public sector.

6. Data Base

The labor market information we use for vocational education programming throughout a state should also influence what we think and decide about the kinds and nature of instructional programs in correctional settings. Again, we must not be training people for unemployment. We must be training them for employment. It is sheer folly to continue to provide training and programs for which there will be no jobs upon release of a client. It is not only folly, but it ought to be considered to be illegal, immoral and all other bad things which do not contribute substantially to the betterment of the individual, his or her needs in an occupation, and in the world of real life outside the confinement of a correctional institution. It is clearly contingent upon each of us to pay attention to good base data information about the labor market as we design new programs, and modify existing programs, in correctional institutions.

7. Participation in Five-Year and Annual Planning

It seems critical to me that the representatives of correctional education programs, be they persons working out of a department of education or working out of a division of correction, ought to have a firsthand and substantive involvement in the five-year and annual planning process for vocational education. This ought to do with major mission and goal statements as well as the specific activities which can be supported through grants-in-aid or special formula allocation to the support of operational programs within correctional institutions. I don't believe that we can simply have a compliance, passive involvement of such people. They ought to be deeply involved as consultants to our five-year planning process and actively involved in the approaches that we take for accessing the input of a broad number of people in the annual updating process. Such persons certainly are going to bring vested interests. It is important that they do just that. Unless we have their involvement and the benefit of their knowledge, biases, and needs, we are never going to have embedded in our plans the essential ingredients for planning and developing programs for vocational education in correctional education.

8. Placement

If education is to become deeply involved in the total delivery system of education for corrections clients, then the whole business of placing persons in work, or in their next educational step, must become the business—at least the joint business—of educational personnel who have anything to do with these programs. The placement issue is one that all of us are going to be doing more about in our regular programs of vocational education in the public schools and community colleges. As all of you know, it is one of the two major criteria upon which we are going to be judged as far as the accountability for our programs. That is, "Was the student placed in an occupation related to his or her training?" We are not doing a very great job with placement at this time. Corrections people may have more experience in placement than those of us in vocational education in the public domain. We may have a good bit to learn from them. We must use this as a key point of making the "corrections connection." It is the ultimate in accountability, as far as I'm concerned. We had better be doing something about it by developing job developers as well as placement officers. We can no longer assume that people are going to get jobs simply because we have probably trained them for what we hope will be a job out there somewhere, sometime.

9. Follow-up

Here again, the persons who have been working in the correctional domain for many years have some very sophisticated methodologies for following up their released clients. I think we in vocational education have something to learn from them. While we have something to learn we also have much to do in the area of designing affective follow-up systems. We must talk to employers. We must learn from them what we are doing right and what we are doing wrong. We must know whether or not we need to modify our programs without throwing the baby out with the bath water. We must have follow-up methods and systems which work; which are not just on paper and used for statistical reporting purposes.

Of all of these several items, I believe planning and accountability are the most important. We cannot jump into the river of the "corrections connection" with both feet at the same time. We will probably drown. If we will take the time to sit together and plan carefully what it is we expect to have happen and build into it dimensions of accountability by very clearly specifying our outcomes through objectives and the performance standards necessary to measure them, then I think we can probably make it.

That must begin with preassessment. We need to know what both education and corrections are doing well and what we are jointly and independently not doing so well. It is on this base of information that we can have decent planning. Thus, the evaluation cycle begins when you start talking about planning and ends (in a continuing way) when we have conducted a summative evaluation of what we did, or at least what we though we said we did.

Another issue that is critically important is the administrative structuring of education in corrections. Whether you hand the whole thing over to education or whether you retain the delivery system within the correctional setting will require very clearly delineated administrative structuring, reporting, and supervisory role identification. It is not a simple issue and one not to be taken lightly. The whole business of administrative structuring within institutions and between agencies has probably caused more problems and blockades to progress in making the "corrections connection" than anything that I can think of.

The role of the education department and specifically vocational education offices or divisions within state education departments also must be clearly identified. Again, I think the key issue is embedded, in part, in structuring. But more importantly, it ought to be concerned with whether or not education is going to be planning and development oriented or planning, development, and implementation oriented. In Maryland, the Division of Vocational-Technical Education has been designated by the State Superintendent of Schools as the lead division for corrections education. We must be careful within our division to keep our view broad-based. Vocational education is not the only portion of a delivery system for education in the corrections setting. While our job will be both developmental and planning in nature, it will be primarily a coordinating function. Of some twelve divisions within the Maryland State Department of Education, at least seven participate actively in varying ways in delivering services of various kinds to the correctional system in the State of Maryland.

Another issue is staffing. While new ventures in correctional education through vocational education, or any other part of education, may require new people—new personnel in varying roles including teaching, counseling, guidance, and so forth—we need also to take a hard look at the needs of personnel who are incumbent in various positions called education in corrections. Many of these folks have arrived at educational jobs in the corrections setting via routes that did not really adequately prepare them to be instructors or counselors or guidance people within the correctional setting. They have learned in the "school of hard knocks." They are very capable people, by and large, but when it comes to new ventures in education, new curriculum constructs and ideas, it is very clear that they, like all teachers, need development, in-service and support through a very clearly developed personnel development system.

Curriculum, both content and the facilities and equipment to carry it out, also surface as major issues in making the "corrections connection." We cannot assume that what's going on there now is all good. Nor should we assume that it is all bad. We should assume that it could probably be improved as can the curriculum situation in any area of education where vocational education is concerned. I am personally in favor of individualized, competency-based, criterion-referenced vocational education curriculum. Maryland is in the V-TECS consortium. I see this effort being extended and embedded in the operation of vocational education in correctional systems. I think it makes a lot of sense and provides the bridge of articulation that we all are going to be depending on if we are going to be able to place and follow-up the clients who are part of this whole operation.

Finally and perhaps most importantly, as we begin to take steps to make the "corrections connection," I think we must have a planned schedule of specific events that carry us into the next four to five years as we sit down to see what it is we can do together. We can no longer say, "Yes, corrections education is important," and let it go at that. We've got to commit to paper, through the practice of specific planning of the various events and steps which have to take place if we are going to really do something about education in the corrections setting. In Maryland, we are designing a four-year scheme which is going to be presented to the next meeting of our corrections council. The first two years are considered "base" years and focus on a state of the art assessment, reviewing related theory (whether it's current or completed) and designing a general plan outline for identifying potential field test elements which can be started up in the first year. The second year, also a "base" year, will revolve around designing and implementing a monitoring, review and assessment system; monitoring field test elements; initiating curriculum change, including staff development activities; beginning phase one implementation of the successful field test elements and, of course, evaluation and reporting (and that's part of accountability). The third year will be a development year and some implementation. We presently plan to extend some of our first year field test elements to full programs as they are found to be successful and viable; continue the phase one curriculum and staff development effort; implement a remodeled follow-up system; implement a placement system and again evaluate and recycle the plan. The fourth year will be a full implementation year if things go as we would think they can. The first part of that will be phase two of curriculum and staff development; phase two of placement and follow-up; initiate phase one of experience-based career education (that is, community-based opportunities) and again evaluate and recycle.

That is a very brief skeletal outline of a four-year plan at this time. It was not hard to do. It sounds pretty theoretical, but it says that we are ready and willing to place some things on paper, to test them out with our advisory groups and our councils and our counterparts in the correctional setting and find out whether or not they'll fly.

Flying may very well depend on having made contact at the right and appropriate times. What I have been talking about is a number of things that have to do with making contact—that is, making the "corrections connection."

PROGNOSIS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

by Byrl R. Shoemaker*

At the outset, I want to compliment both the participants and the persons who organized the conference for both the quality of the program and the quality of the discussions. In spite of the fact that it was a "first of a kind" the conference has been unusually mature and productive. I believe there were two reasons for its success—one was the excellent planning and the involvement of representation from both vocational education and corrections in the planning and the other is the cooperative working relationships which already exist between vocational education and corrections in many of the states.

To begin, I would like to relate some experiences and make some observations.

Secondly, I would like to identify some facts as I see them; thirdly, relate some concerns and lastly, make a prognosis.

My first experience with vocational education in the field of corrections was in 1958. At that time I visited an adult training center operated by the Department of Corrections which had been built with that concept in mind. I could not, however, find any training within the whole facility. Prison industries had taken over areas which were obviously planned initially for training. In 1959 I was among several persons from vocational education who were invited to visit a youth corrections center in Ohio. The administration of the center had asked us to review the educational program as it might relate to vocational training. We found no vocational education of any value or any effort worthy of the name. We found that a large number of youth were not involved in any educational program, much less vocational education. The committee visiting the center made recommendations, looking toward the initiation of vocational programs, but no action was taken. In 1966 a news media spotlight on this same youth corrections center attracted statewide attention and immediate action was taken by the governor to improve the facilities and the educational program, including the introduction of quality vocational education services. As the vocational education programs were established they were established on the basis of the standards for vocational education for youth in the regular high school programs. Programs were initiated in institutions for both males and females and a good close working relationship was established between the vocational education leadership in those institutions and our State Department of Education.

In 1970 our Division of Vocational Education funded a national study of vocational training in the field of corrections. Probably it is the broadest study of vocational education services in correction institutions made to date. This study was under the direction of Mr. Pat Cronin, who has given leadership to the development of this conference.

---

*Byrl R. Shoemaker is Director of Vocational Education, State of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

In 1971 as a result of the study conducted, a cooperative relationship was established between the Department of Corrections, the Youth Commission and our Division of Vocational Education. It was truly a cooperative relationship in that all three of the agencies invested financially in the effort and have continued to do so from that time. The cooperative effort provides for the employment of a full-time supervisor for the improvement, development and expansion of vocational education programs within both the Department of Corrections and the Youth Commission and a full-time teacher educator functioning out of the Ohio State University to provide the teachers in the vocational programs with the same kind of teacher education that is provided for the teachers entering employment in vocational programs with a background in industry.

There has been a slow, but constant growth in both the quantity and quality of vocational education programs in the institutions since the cooperative effort was initiated in 1971. I made a visitation to Marion Training Center two months ago, the same training center that I visited in 1958. On this visit, however, I found high quality vocational education programs in progress, identified and trained teachers, qualified local leadership, proud instructors and satisfied administrators.

The Ohio Vocational Education Association now has a corrections section within that association.

Next, looking at facts, as I see them, most of the training today and for the foreseeable future will be at the skilled and semi-skilled levels. While efforts have been made and will be made to provide for collegiate education for inmates, it will be the unusual inmate that will be involved in such training.

Secondly, vocational education leadership and administrators of programs have started the process of the expansion and improvement of vocational education programs for incarcerated people.

I want to make it clear that we in vocational education are naive in regards to the nature of the people who are incarcerated at both the youth and adult levels. We tend to seethe people in institutions on their best behavior and believe that they are just unfortunate people who are anxious to return to society as rehabilitated human beings. I believe those of us in vocational education have skills and technical knowledge to offer in the field of vocational education, but I am under no illusions that we either understand nor truly comprehend the problems in the field of corrections.

Thirdly, I believe that most program efforts today between vocational education and corrections are more demonstration than saturation. Demonstration type programs are important if they lead to implementation for enough people to make a difference.

Fourthly, I believe that the movement toward the expansion of vocational education in the field of corrections has the blessings of Congress and public officials.

Fifthly, I believe, however, that neither the states nor the federal government have provided more than token funding for such programs.

Sixth, I do not believe that the public has any deep interest in providing adequate funding for any type of programming for incarcerated persons.

Seventh, I do not believe that there are any "votes" in the field of corrections. Any improvements in services will be made upon the basis of enlightened legislators, rather than upon the political impact of persons in corrections.

Eighth, I do not believe that any legislative champion has emerged. While Senator Pell has indicated interest in the vocational programs in the field of corrections, he also stated clearly that he was not going to take this on as a champion of the cause.

Ninth, I believe that the growth and cost of crime in corrections are a sign of decadence in a great nation and that unless solutions are found to deal with prevention more than treatment, our nation will begin the long slide down that most civilizations have followed.

Tenth, I believe that investments in treatment are not as important as investment in solutions. No amount of treatment will provide a solution. I believe that it is important that persons in corrections feedback into society information as to the nature of persons incarcerated and the reasons for their being there. Other social institutions should accept a part of the responsibility and significant changes should be made in our educational system to prevent the flow of persons into the pool of those incarcerated.

Eleventh, from discussions at this conference, it would appear that the problem of people in county jails has not been adequately considered.

Looking next at some concerns, I find that there is a lack of facts on the nature of population in corrections, rates of recidivism, the effectiveness of vocational training on success and on recidivism.

Another concern grows out of discussions at this conference. It appears that there is a significant growth in populations in both youth and adult correction centers. There appears to be no alternatives at the present time to deal with this problem and as the seams bulge, emphasis upon rehabilitation and education will tend to diminish.

Another concern that I have is the fact that most leadership in corrections at the state level changes with elections. This fact makes it difficult to maintain a constant thrust towards the development and expansion of vocational education services within corrections institutions.

Another concern is the lack of funds committed to vocational training in the budgets of youth commissions and departments of corrections. I believe it will be essential that a categorical line item for education be funded either within the Department of Corrections budgets or within the vocational education budget to be used only for corrections education.

Another concern is the lack of continuing national leadership for the area of improvement of vocational education within the field of corrections. Much progress has been made through the National Center for Vocational Education at Ohio State University and continuity for continued development of the relationship between persons in both corrections and vocational education is important.

Finally, to the area of prognosis for vocational education in corrections. Looking to the future, I believe (1) funding dedicated to vocational training in corrections will be provided at both the state and federal levels; the future of vocational education for youth offenders, however, is cloudy, since the short-term of the sentences for youth provides almost a swinging door and it is very difficult to provide them with enough vocational education to make a difference on such short sentences; (2) federal legislation will further encourage vocational training in institutions; (3) vocational training for older youth and adults in corrections institutions will continue to grow and to be related to parole; orientation, work assessment, work evaluation and exploration programs may be the basis for services for youth in youth offender institutions; (5) national statistics related to inmates and programs will be established; (6) vocational training in institutions will be related to ongoing vocational education in the state, including the use of facilities; (7) vocational education will learn from corrections valuable information important to changing the system of education; (8) there are no solutions that do not involve strengthening of the family and family life; investments must be made into this area if rehabilitation is to have any meaning.

SECTION TWO:

THE 1976 EDUCATION ACT AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

- Implications of the 1976 Education Act for Interagency Cooperation
- Implications of the 1976 Education Act for Women's Equity in Corrections
- Vocational Advisory Committees and Corrections

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION TO IMPROVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR OFFENDERS

by LeRoy A. Cornelsen*

Take a look, if you will, at the nation's economic condition, especially as it affects employment. More people are working today than ever before in the history of the United States and yet our unemployment rate remains persistently high—7.3 percent when I last checked the figures. Many would say this is greatly understated because people who have been unsuccessful in finding employment have quit looking and, therefore, are not among those counted as still being unemployed. This includes youth, women who are seeking their first opportunity in paid employment, the elderly who are seeking to supplement fixed incomes, and finally, ex-offenders who are trying to access a very difficult labor market. Then think for a minute, if you will, about the economic conditions facing the country—the escalating energy consumption and its related cost; the spiraling wages and consumer good costs which influence productivity; and the imbalance in our export/import of goods with other countries. All of these influences are affecting the conditions under which employers must employ and use skill personnel, requiring greater and more specialized preparation and higher standards for access to good jobs.

Now if that scene isn't dismal enough for the average individual looking for work, consider for a moment the plight of the ex-offender. Typically, here one finds the continued cultural and social stigma which says that the employment of ex-offenders is an even greater risk so that with reluctant employers, access to good employment is very, very difficult for even the best prepared ex-offenders.

I might not have needed to repeat this description of the constraints, but it seems to me that we must be realistic as we seek ways to improve vocational education for offenders by instituting means and mechanisms by which agencies having a responsibility for offenders can effectively unify and cooperate in the deployment of resources at their disposal for this purpose.

One other condition which I think is important to mention at this point is the variety of approaches and priorities given to education of all kinds by the different states. We truly are a pluralistic society and one needs look only at the major factors such as the finance of education in the different states to realize that there is a wide range of priorities given to education. Considering the per capita income as one indicator, many states are exceeding their relative ability to pay for education in providing the elementary, secondary education, some in the area of vocational education, others at the post-secondary level. But there are an equal number of states that could be considered below their ability to pay in supporting educational programs.

Before entertaining new plans to improve vocational education for offenders in your state institution, agency or locality, I think its important to understand the environmental factors which influence such programs. The element of available finances is important as is the relative political support for making advances and improving vocational education for offenders. But let's stop at this point and quit talking about generalities, but let's talk about things that affect us directly, you and me in particular.

---

*LeRoy A. Cornelsen is Director of Planning, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 and the hearings which preceded them set a good base for making some significant improvements in vocational education for offenders. Senator Pell, from Rhode Island, asked many probing, piercing questions during the hearings with the Office of Education about vocational education for offenders. Answers to his probes accurately reflected a rather dismal response across the country for serving offenders in this way. Sure, there are some state agencies and, perhaps, federal agencies which consider incarceration and lock up as punitive measures which should do little more than supply the barest, minimal, essential amenities for living. But there are more enlightened individuals, agencies, and institutions among each of those that I have mentioned that consider creating opportunities for ex-offenders as an investment in human potential, one which has great potential returns, both to the individual being served and to society at large. But in some respects, responsibility for the plight of the offender is everyone's business and yet, in a way, nobody's business.

Getting back to the new Amendments for a moment, let me read to you the many different agencies that must, by law, be involved in planning for vocational education prior to each state's submission of their plan.

Section 107 requires that any state desiring to receive funds under this Act shall submit to the Commissioner a five year plan which, in formulating this plan, the state board shall have had the active involvement and participation of (a) a representative of the state agency having the responsibility for secondary vocational education, (b) a representative of the state agency having responsibility for post-secondary vocational education, (c) a representative of the state agency having responsibility for community and junior colleges, (d) of higher education in the state, (e) of a local school board or committee, (f) of vocational education teachers, (g) of local school administrators, (h) of the state manpower services council, (i) of the state agency or commission responsible for comprehensive planning in post-secondary education, (j) a representative of the state advisory council on vocational education. This latter council, being made up of persons who represent or are familiar with vocational education needs and problems of management, labor, agriculture, industrial and economic development, community and junior colleges, institutions of higher education, nonprofit private schools, vocational guidance and counseling, vocational education teachers, persons serving as superintendents or other administrators of local education, local school board members, again a representative of the state manpower services council, a representative of school systems with large concentrations of persons who have special academic, social, economic and cultural needs, women with backgrounds and experiences in employment and training programs, persons having knowledge, experience and qualifications with regard to the needs of physical and mentally handicapped, a representative of the general public, of vocational education students who are not otherwise qualified for membership, and a representative of state correctional institutions. While I did not list these in the order in which they appear in the law, a representative of state correctional institutions on the state advisory council is a significant step forward in insuring involvement of persons who have information and experience in knowing about the needs, conditions and requirements for serving offenders with quality vocational education. Add to this impressive list of representatives and groups other federal and state agencies which have a legitimate and appropriate role for involvement; namely, the Department of Justice, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Bureau of Prisons, the Courts, and the many associations that are joined by professionals in this panarama of social concern. It is easy to despair at this point and say, "It is simply impossible to forge enough good-will out of these diverse groups (albeit their rightful role and responsibilities suggest cooperation) to obtain their cooperation."

But how do we distill this down to what you and I can do to make a difference. I am reminded of a conference that I recently attended where some 300 persons were in one large room being addressed by an individual who was considering the various career options people choose because of their personality, their motivation, their various skills and he asked us to indicate our task preference in six major areas. I'll just mention several.

1. Indicated persons who like to run things. They are the organizers, the managers, the leaders, the administrators.
2. The helpers, supporters—teachers and nurses, would fit into that group.
3. Another group, the persons who support top management by following through on assignments or conducting systematic analysis on data, etc.

While I knew this group at that conference was not a heterogeneous one, when persons were asked to identify with one of the groups, not a single person agreed that their preference belonged in the groups which would follow up top management and cause things to happen. It was very clear then to the conference leader that unless those of us in attendance had good supportive staff and that we would communicate the results of the conference to these persons, nothing would ever result from the conference or our having been involved in it. So what I am really talking about is that we can't allow ourselves to be placed in the position of saying someone else must be cooperative—it's some ambiguous "they" out there who are the culprits which prevent progress. It's us, it's you, it's me. Now I am not interested in lecturing to you in attempting to persuade you to put aside petty turf acquisition activities or even the extent to which you engage in the occupation of turf management. Some of that I am sure is appropriate for maintenance of our ability to perform as organizational elements with purpose and capability. But in the case of cooperating with other agencies, other persons, it comes down to an individual matter.

I would like to conclude by pointing out several cooperative endeavors that indicate progress and some reason for cautions optimism. First, the Office of Education has funded several projects concerning corrections and vocational education for offenders. Each of these projects are involving representatives from a broad spectrum of organizations and agencies in either advisory or working capacities. Considerable unanimity and cooperation is evident in the way these projects are being conducted. Last summer my office developed a staff paper on the "Role of Vocational Education in Prisons" which was given limited circulation. The response by a variety of interest groups and individuals tells me that on this subject motivation is high and commitment is sincere. I think progress will be made.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE 1976 EDUCATION ACT FOR WOMEN'S EQUITY IN CORRECTIONS

by Eileen Lehman*

In the development and passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, Congress has provided the field of education with a landmark piece of legislation. A few years earlier, in 1972, the Congress had acknowledged discrimination against women with the passage of Title IX. That law forbids discrimination on the basis of sex and is administered by the OCR. Again in 1974, Congress acknowledged that educational programs in the United States are inequitable and passed the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA). But it is in Vocational Education—Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976—that for the first time awareness of sex bias and sex-stereotyping has been made an integral part of a major piece of legislation.

Under Title II, funds are authorized to assist states in planning and implementing programs, including the developing and carrying out of "programs of vocational education, so as to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education programs (including programs of homemaking), and thereby furnish equal educational opportunities in vocational education to persons of both sexes."

In addition to administering these amendments and the WEEA, the Office of Education has responsibility for providing leadership in the elimination of discrimination on the basis of sex and for providing equal educational opportunities for girls and women.

Sexism, like racism is perpetuated through our institutions. It is conveyed through the socialization process. In the educational system it is perpetuated through the placement of students into certain programs or courses on the basis of sex; through instructional materials; through counseling given; through staffing patterns wherein the persons lowest in authority are predominantly female and those with authority are predominantly male; and through the behavior of teachers, behaviors which tacitly reprove or encourage certain skills or attitudes in females and not in males.

In assuming this position of leadership, the Office of Education looked at the programs it administered to determine where it was contributing to sex role bias. It found, to give one example, that the Educational Leadership Program was primarily training men to be administrators. Where biases existed, the Office revised its regulations and guidelines. The proposed regulations for the Vocational Education Legislation have been published and comments will still be read, although the deadline date for comment has passed.

Under the new legislation in Vocational Education, each state must reserve $50,000 from its basic vocational education grant to help support "such full-time personnel as may be necessary" to focus on sex bias. Some of the responsibilities delineated are:

---

*Eileen Lehman is Title IX Coordinator, United States Office of Education, Region VI, Dallas, Texas.

- to review all vocational education programs in the state for sex bias;
- to monitor the implementation of laws prohibiting sex discrimination in all hiring, firing and promotion procedures in vocational education;
- to assist school systems and others in improving vocational education opportunities for women;
- to review the distribution of state grants to assure that the interest and needs of women are addressed in projects funded under this act;
- to create awareness of vocational education programs and activities designed to reduce sex stereotyping.

The person(s) hired to fill the position should provide a valuable resource to correctional institutions, who are interested in improving vocational education for women in corrections.

Membership on the state advisory council must include women with experience in employment and training programs who are also knowledgeable regarding the problems of sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education. The council must also include as members a representative for state correctional institutions. It is an opportunity for these two representatives to work together for education equity for women in prison.

Within the five-year state plan which is being developed now, the state must set forth those policies and procedures it will follow to assure equal access to vocational education programs by both men and women including:

- a detailed description of such policies and procedures;
- actions to be taken to overcome sex discriminations and sex stereotyping in all state and local vocational education programs;
- incentives to eligible recipients so that the recipients will (1) encourage the enrollment of both women and men in non-traditional courses of study, and (2) develop model programs to reduce sex stereotyping in all occupations.

Each state will be holding public hearings on its state plan and those of you interested in the educational equity for women in prison should review it and make recommendations.

It is an unfortunate fact that sex bias in vocational education is pervasive. The system which provides a direct link to the employment system consists almost entirely of separate boys' and girls' courses, or in courses whose enrollment are predominantly of a single sex. Across the nation, data indicate the composition of technical programs is 90.2 percent male and 9.8 percent female. Most of the programs for women are built on the false assumption that a woman will never have to, or never want to earn a living. Even in traditionally female areas, young women are in supportive rather than independent roles, e.g., in the health related vocations which are 84.7 percent female, girls are in the low paying specialties such as practical nursing, aides, and dental technicians.

In the corrections system, this pattern is repeated and certain vocational education courses are deemed appropriate for a person by sex rather than ability. Cosmetology is a popular vocational education program for females in corrections, yet it does not pay compared to areas of training offered to males. A study of vocational education programs in corrections in 1973 reviewed a wide variety of training projects operated at correctional institutions. Some of the training was in new and exciting fields, others were non-sexist like optical mechanics, but only traditional training programs appeared to be available to women.

In education we are only beginning to realize the extent to which textbooks and other curricula materials convey information about the norms, values, and behavior patterns accepted in our society. The message of the culture, as conveyed through the books, and the media, is that the only roles a woman need prepare for are those of wife and mother. The role models portrayed in the school curriculum do not encourage girls to be skillful and successful in a career, or even to pursue a career as they do for boys. Instead girls are encouraged to pursue homemaking, be pretty and be passive. Throughout the books girls are shown in domestic roles, cooking and cleaning. Girls are encouraged to make themselves attractive. They are shown combing their hair, trying on clothes, etc. The pictures project the message that success for girls will be in serving and pleasing others.

Women in corrections rejected that message, or they bought it in unorthodox ways. Yet, frequently, rehabilitation programs are still trying to sell the same message which shortchanged women in the first place. Working is just temporary, until one marries. In the real world, roles for males and females are changing. The traditionally organized family when the husband was the sole bread winner, and the wife, the sole homemaker, has shifted to multiple role families where both share responsibility for the household tasks and for earnings.

While textbooks continue to show the world of adults is a world of men by illustrating men as chemists, doctors, farmers, pilots; and women as housewives, adult women in our society do many things.

Today, 40 percent of the U.S. labor force is female. In fact, 90 percent of all women work outside their home at some point in their lives. One of the most frustrating experiences of working women is discovering too late that they don't have the skills or training they need for the jobs they want, or the jobs that pay well. Incidentally, two thirds of the adults in poverty are women. Women work for the same reasons men do, because of need. For the msot part, they are women whose husbands have incomes below $7,000 per year, or they are single, widowed, divorced or separated. When a prison record is added to poor skills, a woman is twice disadvantaged.

Women are concentrated in the lower paid and less skilled jobs. While these jobs have been called "premarital" jobs, the average woman remains in them twenty-five years, more than double the worklife expectancy of the average woman in 1940. A single woman can expect to work forty-five years. The median earnings of women are 59 percent of what men earn and the gap is widening. Minority women are doubly deprived of benefits. Employment figures indicate white males earn higher incomes than black males, who in turn earn more than white women, who earn more than black women.

Women and girls especially inmates need to be encouraged to seek non-traditional jobs if they wish to secure high incomes. Current vocational education courses are not preparing women to do that. Girls and women must be integrated into the vocational education courses traditionally offered to males.

Teachers of academics in corrections can supplement their coursework with exercises on sex role stereotyping and involve the student in finding illustrations of sex bias; stimulate classroom discussion on ways to eliminate sexism; and conduct other activities to open up choices to women.

While many women have been trained in vocational education programs in the past, figures for 1972 indicate half of the women receiving federally aided vocational training were enrolled in non-gainful home economics classes. Under the new legislation, programs are authorized which seek to retrain homemakers for careers.

Under the basic grant section of the new amendment which provides the largest amount of money to the states and is a major consolidation of programs, states may allocate funds for:

- support services for women who enter programs designed to prepare individuals for employment in jobs which have been traditionally limited to men, including counseling relative to the nature of such programs and the difficulties which may be encountered by women in such programs, and job development and job follow-up services.
- day care services for children of students in secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs.
- vocational education for:
    a. persons who had solely been homemakers but who now, because of dissolution of marriage, must seek employment,
    b. persons who are single heads of household and who lack adequate job skills,
    c. persons who are currently homemakers and part-time workers but who wish to secure a full-time job, and
    d. women and men employed in jobs which are traditional for their sex, who wish to seek employment in non-traditional areas.

States are also authorized to fund Program and Improvement and Supportive Services if the amount of funds for this section of the legislation is approximately one-fourth of the Basic Grants. Funds may be used for such areas as research, exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, guidance and counseling services, training, and grants to overcome sex bias. The law then specifies how funds may be used under these general areas to impact on sex bias.

Under research, experimental, developmental, and pilot programs may be designed to overcome problems of sex bias and sex stereotyping, and for the development of improved and/or new curricular materials, including a review and revision of any curricula developed under this section to insure that such curricula do not reflect stereotypes based on sex, race, or national origin.

In funding projects in the area of exemplary and innovative projects, every state must give priority to projects designed to reduce sex stereotyping in vocational education.

Funds may be used for the development of curriculum and guidance and testing materials designed to overcome sex bias in vocational education programs, and support services designed to enable teachers to meet the needs of individuals enrolled in vocational education programs traditionally limited to members of the opposite sex.

Vocational guidance and counseling programs are to include training designed to acquaint guidance counselors with:

1. the changing work patterns of women,
2. ways of effectively overcoming sex stereotyping,
3. ways of assisting girls and women in selecting careers solely on their occupational needs and interests, and to develop improved career counseling materials which are free.

In addition, the Act states funds may be used for vocational and educational counseling for youth offenders and adults in correctional institutions. It would appear that counseling programs developed for women in correctional institutions should reflect the same concern with the changing work patterns of women and assist girls and women in selecting careers that are non-traditional.

Programs funded may include those that provide in-service training to improve the quality of instruction, supervision and administration of vocational education programs and to overcome sex bias in vocational education programs.

In-service training for counselors, supervisors and teachers on awareness of sex bias and sex role stereotyping is one of the most effective ways to get non-stereotypical programs offered in corrections and to assist girls and women to make choices in career preparation.

Counselors and supervisors, like everyone else, have internalized notions of appropriate academics, career and life roles for females and males. They may see girls as doing well in literature, and males succeeding in math and science, girls with verbal ability and boys skilled in analytical and mechanical ability. They may then guide them in these stereotypical directions. They may also incorrectly assume that while work is primarily important to boys, girls should settle down and marry.

Vocational aptitude tests frequently discriminate. Women and girls with the same interests and abilities as men and boys can be directed into bookkeeping while boys may be guided into accounting. Counselors need to assess the vocational skills of inmates without regard to sex.

Counselors need to help girls and women set career goals for good pay and interesting and satisfying work that uses their full abilities and talents than to get just a job. Jobs or careers for women should not be any different from jobs for men. Decisions with respect to gainful and satisfying employment for women should be made on the basis of occupational outlook and the demand for workers in the growth occupations as well as on "individual" interests and capabilities. Most inmates will need help in the development of a career plan as they may have unrealistic stereotypical expectations.

It is not simply a matter of offering a vocational education program in refrigeration and air conditioning, or auto mechanics to women in prisons. The women may be hesitant working with unfamiliar equipment, or encounter hostility or ridicule from males if it is a coed class. Vocational education teachers should be aware of these problems and be ready to lend support.

Personnel may feel women would not want to, or should not want to work around machinery, or bricks or pipes. Yet the facts are that women are employed in all kinds of occupations; jobs that require precision work, mechanical aptitude and a few in jobs that involve dangerous materials.

New language in the consumer and homemaking education section directs that courses be more sensitive to the changing needs of modern families. It encourages among other activities, participation of both males and females to prepare for combining the roles of homemakers and wage earners; to encourage the elimination of sex stereotyping in consumer and homemaking education by promoting the development of curriculum materials which deal with increased numbers of women working outside the home; and to increase numbers of men assuming homemaking responsibilities and the changing career patterns for women and men.

While a number of specific programs authorized in the legislation do not relate directly to corrections, the intent is clear that educational equity for women is a basic requirement of vocational education.

Another piece of legislation that targets on every area of education which perpetuates sex bias, thereby opening many avenues to provide educational equity for women, is WEEA. The activities allowable include:

- the development, evaluation, and dissemination of curricula, textbooks, and other educational materials;
- preservice and in-service training for educational personnel, including guidance and counseling personnel;
- research;
- guidance and counseling activities, including the development of tests which are non-discriminating on the basis of sex, educational activities to include opportunities for adult women, including educational activities and programs for underemployed and unemployed women;
- the expansion and improvement of educational programs and activities for women in vocational education, career education, physical education, and education administration.

The Act also authorizes a program of small grants not to exceed $15,000 for innovative projects.

Under this program, which has only 6 million dollars, three model projects were funded relating to women offenders. One at Miami-Dade Community College is to design and develop a comprehensive career development model with emphasis on women offenders in the stage of transition from the correctional institution to the community outside.

Products will include a comprehensive career development model for women offenders, techniques for creating interest in non-traditional careers and counseling techniques for ex-offenders.

A pretrial intervention program has been established by Job Options for Women on Probation, Inc. in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

The YWCA in Springfield, Massachusetts is concerned with the systematic denial of educational services to women incarcerated, and is developing a plan to incorporate educational needs for both pretrial and sentenced women inmates. A "how to" report will be available to county sheriffs nationwide to assist in adding educational services for their women's sections.

A number of other products are being developed this year (which is the first year of funding) which will be useful to schools and other institutions concerned with providing educational equity to women. Because the concern and development of vocational education programs in corrections is at a beginning stage, this is your opportunity to develop and introduce non-sexist education to men and women.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR WOMEN IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

by Ruth M. Glick*

The problems faced by women in our society are intensified for the female offender in a correctional setting.

Women in our society are defined almost from birth in terms of a set of "ideal" characteristics that have evolved over centuries. Women are (supposed to be) warm, nurturing, caring and intuitive; they are not expected to be aggressive, intelligent or ambitious—these traits belong to males.

It is interesting to note that the specific characteristics which are ascribed to females are rooted in both biological and social (economic) functions. The ideal woman is MOTHER.

While it is undeniable that these characteristics are admirable and, in fact, necessary for the survival of the species, it is equally apparent that the characteristics we ascribe to males have much greater value in terms of personal survival in the work world.

The changing roles of both males and females in modern industrial society are related to a wide spectrum of social and economic changes, not the least of which is the control of reproduction—a condition that is both a result of technological/medical knowledge (contraception) and a growing awareness that technological changes have made it ecologically necessary to control family size.

These are not startling revelations, however, they must be explicitly stated in order to deal realistically with the problems now facing us in education generally; in vocational education specifically.

We are constantly being reminded that our task is to develop educational programs that will overcome sex bias in employment. Before we rush headlong into such programs, let's examine some of the realities.

The 1976 Education Act has some specific provisions relating to the problem of sex bias—specifically sex bias as it relates to women:

> First of all, funding has been added for "grants to overcome sex bias" and for "personnel to assist in reducing sex bias."
>
> Second, specific language in the legislation recognizes some of the many problems related to changing strongly held values and beliefs:

---

*Ruth M. Glick is Chief, Correctional Planning, California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, California.

- "assure that the interest and needs of women are addressed"
- "incentives to encourage enrollment of women"
- "improving vocational opportunities for women"

Overcoming sex bias has several important aspects:

1. Social role of women (wives & mothers first, workers second)
2. Cultural roles (related both to ethnic/racial background and to social class)
3. Reality of job opportunities for women (mobility-ability to move with husband)
4. Need for adequate child care (and a willingness to use it)
5. Formal and informal learning experiences (using tools around the house)
6. Male attitudes toward women in non-traditional roles/jobs

In the correctional setting, all of the problems mentioned above apply; however they are compounded by several additional factors:

- the women are offenders and will carry that label back with them to the work world.
- their educational level is below average.

The small number of women in most of our local and state correctional facilities and the diversity of their backgrounds and experiences make it unlikely that we will ever be able to develop self-contained programs to meet all their needs.

We must think in more creative terms and perhaps the 1976 Education Act with its provision to include a representative from corrections on state and local advisory councils will provide an unparalleled opportunity to develop some joint planning activities to provide both diversity and flexibility in programs for all offenders—including women.

HOW CAN CORRECTIONS USE VOCATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES?

by Lowell A. Burkett*

"How can corrections use vocational advisory committees?" This is a particularly appropriate time to address that question, for in recent years, federal legislation has placed more and more emphasis on involving advisory committees in vocational education. The Vocational Amendments of 1968 mandated a vocational advisory committee for every state and the 1976 Vocational Education Law strengthens the role of the state advisory committees. The new legislation also calls for local advisory committees for all vocational programs, and it is this provision that will affect vocational programs in correctional institutions most strongly. The membership of these local advisory committees must represent all elements of the community served, including citizens prominent in various occupations in business, labor, and industry.

The Congress is not merely requesting politely that we cooperate in using advisory committees; federal funding is linked to the fulfillment of these conditions. So we now have a powerful incentive to use advisory committees in our programs. The puzzling thing, however, is that we need to be prodded by the federal government to make full use of the potential of advisory committees. Throughout the history of vocational education, advisory committees have been recognized as useful tools in improving vocational programs. Yet they are not used nearly as widely as one might suppose. A recent study, for example, found that only about one-third of the vocational education programs in correctional institutions throughout the nation even have advisory committees. And many of the advisory committees that do exist look good on paper only—they may meet only once or twice a year and have minimal impact on vocational programs.

It is hard to account for our reluctance as administrators in the field of vocational education to use advisory committees to the fullest extent possible. As professionals, we may be tempted to think that we don't need the help of the lay person in running our programs. We may even think of the recommendations offered by an advisory committee as interference. Another explanation might be that we expect too much of advisory committees and then are disappointed when all our problems don't vanish miraculously. Advisory committees are not a cure-all for the problems of a vocational education program. They are only one part of a total approach to achieving quality vocational education. The author of a recent article in the *American Vocational Journal* (Bill Woolard, "Taking Advantage of Strong Tailwinds," March 1977, 32) made an observation that is apropos to the point I want to make. He said, "Advisory groups are to educators what weather is to pilots—either a threat or a strong positive force. Available facts must be studied, concepts understood, and a course plotted to avoid the ill forces and utilize the good ones." The moral to be drawn here is that used properly, advisory committees can be like a strong tailwind that will help you, as the pilot of a vocational program, reach your destination more quickly.

---

*Lowell A. Burkett is Executive Director, American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.

There are two basic ways advisory committees can serve vocational education. One of these is to advise vocational educators on all phases of new and existing programs: planning, development, placement of graduates, and evaluation. The second broad purpose is to help build public support for vocational programs. If advisory committees can give us meaningful help in these two vital areas, we will be well on our way to meeting our goals for quality vocational programs.

I will be discussing in some detail how vocational advisory committees can be used as resources for accomplishing these goals. In many cases, I won't make any distinction between advisory committees for vocational programs in correctional institutions and those in other kinds of institutions. When there are special circumstances affecting the operation of advisory committees in a correctional setting, however, I will point them out as I go along.

Let's explore the first purpose of the vocational advisory committee: to make recommendations on planning, development, placement, and evaluation for vocational programs. In the first step—planning—the advisory committee can participate as new programs are initiated or existing ones are maintained and improved. One persistent problem in vocational education is to plan programs that are relevant to the ever-changing manpower needs of the nation. Because the members of advisory committees are active in many occupations in business and industry, they have direct knowledge of the occupational skills needed in a community or the state as a whole.

When an institution is assessing the need for a new vocational program, the advisory committee can offer valuable advice on whether there will be enough job opportunities in that occupation to accommodate vocational graduates. In many cases, the data needed to decide whether to initiate a new program will go beyond what the advisory committee members can supply on the basis of their own experiences, and an occupational survey will be necessary. When this happens, the advisory committee can assist in identifying the data that should be gathered. If a decision is made to initiate a new program, the advisory committee will be active in making recommendations on the curriculum, instructional materials, new equipment, and any new facilities to be built.

Advisory committees can also help in the planning that is necessary to maintain and improve existing programs. Changes are taking place almost daily in the technology of many occupational areas, and new processes and products are introduced at an alomost frightening rate. It is difficult for us in vocational education to keep up with the rapid pace. Because members of an advisory committee are in tough with the realities of the work-day world, they can often give valuable help in recommending new equipment and instructional materials.

It might be pertinent here to mention the two kinds of advisory committees that a correctional institution might use: the general advisory committee and the curriculum or craft advisory committee. The general advisory committee advises on overall program decisions affecting all occupational areas. The members of a craft or curriculum advisory committee, on the other hand, are all experts in a single program area such as electronics or health occupations. Because of the specialized knowledge the members have, the craft advisory committee can make very specific recommendations on skills, instructional materials, equipment, qualifications of instructors, and standards for a certain program. The needs of a particular institution would determine whether it has both kinds of advisory committees or only a general advisory committee.

A special problem faced by correctional institutions is that vocational education programs are often geared to the needs of the institution rather than to the needs of the individual or of society as a whole. There are many jobs in correctional institutions that have to be done, and the labor is often supplied by inmates. Examples are cooking, maintenance, and janitorial work. When this work is tied in with the vocational training offered, a problem develops. Vocational programs should not exist primarily to serve the needs of an institution, but to serve the individual and society as a whole.

A major goal of vocational programs in correctional institutions should be to return offenders to society with marketable skills. Ideally, these programs should cover the full range of skills needed to enter many occupations outside the institution. If this goal is met, the offender will have a better chance of finding employment after release, and in the long run, society as well as the individual will benefit.

Advisory committees can help move vocational programs in this direction because they are outside the correctional setting and therefore will not be influenced unduly by the purely administrative needs of the institution. They can use their knowledge of the occupational skills needed in the community or state to help plan curricula that are broad in scope. Because advisory committee members often use the products of vocational training in their own businesses and industries, they demand quality from all educational delivery systems.

In addition to helping plan programs, advisory committees have a role in program development. They monitor ongoing programs and help solve problems that arise in implementing them. One valuable contribution of advisory committees is to help plan work-oriented experiences for students. In corrections, this means aiding with work-release and study-release programs. An inmate who participates in one of these programs leaves the institution for designated periods of time to pursue vocational goals. Study release programs enable an institution to expand the vocational program beyond its own facilities, equipment, and instructional staff. When the facilities of community colleges and other institutions in the community can be used for part of a correctional institution's vocational program, inmates will have a wider selection of programs.

The work release program provides another way to extend the range of opportunities for occupational training available to inmates. It also serves as a bridge for the inmate between the vocational education classroom within the institution and the working environment outside.

Advisory committees can recommend specific arrangements for these community-based programs. For work release programs, they may be helpful in selecting employers with up-to-date, high-grade, safe equipment. The members of the committee can also work, both formally and informally, towards community acceptance of such programs. If tension does arise in the community as these programs are developed, members of the advisory committee will be good barometers for gauging public opinion, and can give administrators good advice on how to proceed.

Placement of vocational graduates is another area in which advisory committees can participate. In corrections, they may recommend procedures for finding post-release employment for inmates. Members of an advisory committee may even help secure appropriate positions for inmates with vocational skills after release, although this is not normally part of their official duties. They can also overcome job discrimination often faced by those who have served time in a correctional institution.

It is also essential for advisory committees to have a role in program review and evaluation. By establishing procedures for follow-up of vocational program graduates and leavers, advisory committees will have a sound basis for judging whether the programs are achieving their objectives. In the correctional setting, the advisory committee might need to determine whether those who leave the institution with marketable job skills have a lower rate of recidivism than those who do not.

We have seen, then, that advisory committees can be an effective tool in planning, development, placement, and evaluation for vocational programs. I'd like to return now to the second overall purpose of the advisory committee, which is to help build public support for vocational programs. In public education institutions, where the financial base is largely dependent on local taxes, the public support sought by advisory committees is directly related to the financial well-being of vocational programs. In corrections, the situation is somewhat different. Since correctional institutions receive their funding from state and federal sources, they are not directly dependent on the communities in which they are located for their financial survival. But since the average citizen's tax dollar is still the mainstay of vocational programs in correctional institutions, the support of each community is essential. Advisory committees must work to arouse public support at all levels, or eventually a lower priority for state and federal funding will be set for vocational programs in correctional institutions.

In addition to financial considerations, there is another reason correctional institutions particularly need to establish good relations with the community. There seems to be a trend in corrections towards using community-based programs to help reintegrate the individual into society. If this process is to succeed, the cooperation and active support of each community are essential. Work-release and study-release programs are doomed if the local communities resist them.

You might be asking what it is specifically that advisory committees can do to assist in building community support. They can help link vocational programs to the community in several ways. First of all, as they serve on a vocational advisory committee, citizens become familiar with the goals and operations of vocational education within the institution, and through their conversations with others in the community, knowledge about and enthusiasm for these programs spreads.. Even after an advisory committee member finishes a term, he or she will continue to be a good public relations agent in the community. And, of course, as committee members complete their terms and are replaced by other citizens, an increasingly large segment of the community is directly involved in the vocational program. This is almost certain to result in better communication and understanding between the institution and the public.

Advisory committees can take some other steps to foster public knowledge about vocational programs in corrections. For example, a local advisory committee might sponsor tours of the institution's vocational education facilities by personnel in business and industry. These key people, when familiarized with the vocational offerings of the institution, are likely to be more receptive to participating in work-release programs and to hiring inmates after release. The advisory committee could then turn the tables and arrange for inmates to tour local businesses and industries. This would serve not only as a career exploration experience for the inmates, but would help create better communication between the correctional institution and the public.

I have pointed out a number of ways, both general and specific, that advisory committees can be used in a correctional setting to help improve vocational programs. I would like to caution you now, however, that it is not enough simply to appoint an advisory committee and give the members free rein to accomplish these objectives. The effectiveness of advisory committees depends, to a great extent, on how we in vocational education use them. It is essential that both the administrative staff of the institution and the committee members understand thoroughly the proper role of the advisory committee. The key word here is advisory. Advisory committees make recommendations for action, but they have no legislative or administrative authority themselves. If this is not made clear from the beginning, advisory committee members may become disgruntled if their advice is not followed.

On the other hand, the recommendations of the advisory committee should not be taken lightly. The purpose of the advisory committee is not to simply rubberstamp the decisions of those who administer vocational programs. We gain nothing by trying to sell members of an advisory committee on our program; it is far better to spend the time listening rather than talking. If the advisory committee is highly critical of a program, we should heed their suggestions and try to remedy the situation. When the advice of the committee is followed, the members should be commended and kept posted on problems and progress. When the advice is not followed, ill-feeling may be avoided if the rationale for choosing a different course of action is explained carefully to the advisory committee.

For an advisory committee to have a real impact on vocational programs, it must meet more than once or twice a year. Only citizens with the time to meet at frequent intervals should be selected to serve on the committee.

The U.S. Congress, as I said before, has placed a high priority on involving advisory committees in vocational programs. But the Congress cannot mandate successful advisory committees. For this to come about, administrators and others in vocational education must believe in these committees and make every effort to use them effectively. Through the advisory committee, we have an opportunity to be more responsive to the public whose tax dollars pay for vocational programs. If we are willing to take the trouble to work with them, I think we may be pleasantly surprised at the contributions advisory committees can make to improving vocational programs.

SECTION THREE:

FUNDING AND DELIVERING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

- Funding Vocational Education Programs in Corrections
- Approaches for Delivering Vocational Education in Corrections

FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION PROBLEMS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ISSUES IN CORRECTIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by Raymond Bell*

For the past several months my staff has, under the auspices of the National Evaluation Program of the Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, LEAA, been emersed in a study of assemble, in a structured fashion, available knowledge in the broad area of correctional education for inmates in adult state and federal prisons in the continental United States. It is from this perspective that I have been asked to address the problems of funding and administering vocational education problems.

The first work product of this effort was the development of an issue paper in which those issues pertinent to correctional education in general and to its major program areas, including vocational education, were presented and summarized.[1] The issues identified in this document were a synthesis of those identified in the literature, the research and by a number of experts in the field. While in no way representing all the issues which relate to such a complex topic, they are the ones which seem to be readily agreed to by a substantive body of opinion in the field, in the literature and in the research.

The issues we presented were clustered around five major areas:

- Evaluation
- Access to Resources and Materials
- Program Design
- The Nature of the Institution
- Administration and Funding

Before turning to a more detailed discussion of this latter area, let me briefly summarize the issues identified in the other four areas because I am of the opinion they are directly or indirectly linked to the problem of funding and administering correctional education programs.

---

*Raymond Bell is Director, National Correctional Education Evaluation Project, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

[1] Raymond Bell et al., *Correctional Education Programs for Inmates: The Issues,* Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., January 1977. This study was supported by grant No. 76-NI-99-0126 from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, United States Department of Justice. Such support does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the contents of this report.

In the area of evaluation there was but one single issue—the singular lack of any rigorous and systematic evaluation. There are many reasons for this including:

- The lack of measurable objectives,
- The lack of a mandate to conduct such evaluations by funding agencies,
- The lack of research and measurement expertise in the system,
- The lack of interest by many researchers or investigators because of lack of funds and the low priority of correctional education in the total research spectrum,
- The inability to control all the variables,
- The difficulty in establishing any sort of acceptable control group and thus to establish any sort of experimental design,
- The hostile environment of the correctional institutions,
- Lack of concern for assessing the marketability of training and skills acquired which in turn is related to,
- Lack of established needs in the job market to which the inmate will return upon release,
- The extreme concerns for either security or humane treatment often preclude measurement of any specific program outcomes as possible standards for evaluation,
- Researchers are at odds about the use of recidivism rates for measuring the effectiveness of educational programs. One school of research argues that the only real evaluation of success is impact on recidivism rate, while the other maintains that any attempt to connect educational success to recidivism is unrealistic.

The area identified as access to resources and materials presents other issues but the three most commonly presented are:

1. Inadequate and anachronistic materials and machinery.

   This issue seems to be compounded by two factors. The nature of the typical client—an adult inmate with severely retarded academic growth—makes it difficult to find materials which are appropriate and effective for offender populations. Publishers have yet to prepare appropriate high interest and low readability texts or supplementary materials that are relevant to such populations in sufficient quantities and variety. Secondly, the relatively low budgets for correctional education often do not allow purchase of modern instructional hardware, especially in the vocational education field. Consequently much of the instruction is carried out with out-dated equipment which is hardly conducive to the attainment of skills readily marketable upon release.

2. Security constraints often limited access to resources.

   Many inmates cannot benefit from educational courses which may include the use of tools, dissecting instruments, chemicals, or controversial publications. Some institutions continue to discourage the use of female instructors no matter how competent on the ground that they are "a threat to security."

3. A lack of contact with "external" resources and personnel.

   As identified earlier, the isolation of the prison from the general community, as much by geographic location as by architectural design, means that those resources which are normally available to other educational enterprises are rarely evident in the prison classroom. Few people are willing to visit and volunteer their services in support of an educational program in an isolated correctional institution on a regular basis, and security regulations often preclude inmate participation in community offerings.

The design of education programs within corrections also presented issues that seem in need of further exploration. Most particular of the issues identified were:

- Often courses are not part of an integrated program.

  Many of the courses presented appear to be islands unto themselves rather than being part of a planned educational program which in turn is part of an integrated treatment plan. This ad hoc approach has little, if any, meaning to the inmate and has no relevance to his needs upon release.

- There is a lack of specificity in the design of courses.

  Many courses have no specific goals in mind and no adequate pre and post assessment. They often reflect the worst of the public school offerings in which the inmate has already experienced failure and which may have little meaning for him either presently or in the future.

- There are inadequate procedurea and criteria for student selection for, and placement in appropriate educational programs.

  There is distinct support for the view that the procedures by which students are selected for, and placed in correctional education programs are, at best, inadequate. The instruments used are often inappropriate, invalid and badly administered. The criteria for placement in programs often include availability, time remaining on sentence, number required to complete minimal class roster, whim of counselor or lack of any alternative.

- There is a distinct lack of support services (diagnosis, counseling and career planning) especially after release.

  In order that educational programming is carried out to the inmates' benefit there is the need for accurate educational diagnosis, counseling, and career planning on a continuing basis. The lack of these support services is a clear issue. The literature received also indicated that such services assume critical importance immediately prior to release and particularly during the first months "on the street."

- There is poor quality of instruction and a lack of specially trained teachers.

  This has been identified as an area of critical importance by most authorities. The special needs and circumstances of inmates require specially trained teachers with unusual personal qualities. Such teachers are rare due to the small number of training programs specifically designed for correctional educators. The difficulties experienced in teaching in corrections have forced many good staff out of the field. The vacuum has often been filled by teachers and administrators who are inadequately trained to meet the specific educational needs of the prison population.

The issues associated with the nature of the institution were:

- The conflict between the contradictory philosophies espoused by custodial and treatment personnel.

  The difference in attitude is of long standing and an accurate reflection of the prevailing attitudes within the society-at-large. This issue, however, is compounded by the relatively wide, and acknowledged, rift between the treatment and education modalities within prisons. The outcomes of this "triangulation" are lack of communication, some hostility, internal competition for funds and lack of an integrated treatment plan which includes educational objectives.

- The low priority of the educational programs within prisons.

  A direct outcome of this issue has been a lack of adequate assignment of space, staff and materials. In addition, there is a widely reported lack of cooperation and understanding among non-educational and educational staff within the institution, making educational activities seem more susceptable to interruption than any other institutional activity. These both attest and contribute to education's low priority status within the institutional framework.

- The limitation of educational opportunity by lack of contact with the outside world.

  Community resources and experiences normally available to those enrolled in all levels of education programs in the community are almost non-existent in the correctional institution program. This makes implementation of an effective vocational, social or post-secondary education program particularly difficult because such "external" resources and experiences are invaluable.

- The lack of real incentive and the use, often subtle, of coercion to enroll in education programs.

  The inmate is often put at a disadvantage when enrolling in an educational program. Frequently he is embarking upon a venture at which he has previously failed. The financial rewards for participation in education programs within the intra-structure of the prison are often lower than those for any of the alternative activities he could choose. The availability of educational programs may be restricted to the evenings when more attractive alternatives are available. An inmate's efforts in a program are not always reinforced by his inmate peer group. However, in spite of these negative forces, he may be coerced, albeit subtly, into attending class by the suggestion that such attendance will look good on his parole or commutation application.

- The hostility of security staff toward educational personnel.

  Security staff are often resentful of free educational opportunities made available to "criminals" since they or their families have never had the opportunity to avail themselves of such free opportunities. Moreover, their education and that of their families may have cost them dearly. This issue seems to be particularly critical in times of general economic hardship such as those experienced in recent years. This attitude on the part of the security staff is often manifested by a lack of enthusiasm for the efforts of the correctional educator. It may also result in an indirect "sabotage" of some programs.

I have presented, albeit briefly, these issues because I believe to a greater or lesser extent they have their origins in the are I now wish to explore in a little more depth—the funding and administration of educational programs.

Let me summarize the issues here and then make some specific comments as they seem to relate to vocational education.

Six major issues appeared over and over again in our work:

Issue 1. Conflict between those external agencies responsible for the funding and administration of educational programs for inmates.

This issue seems to have its roots in the fact that there are usually several agencies within each system which have some responsiblity for providing educational programs for inmates. These may include; but are not limited to, the state departments of education, and welfare, the state department of corrections, several local institutions of higher education and local public school systems. While this has been ameliorated to some extent by a centralized or regionalized administration in the federal system and within some states, most sources see this as a principle issue.

Issue 2. Conflict between administrators within the prison.

Most authorities indicate that this issue is an outcome of the fact that critical administrative and policy making decisions relative to educational programming are made by those who are most concerned with security.

Issue 3. Lack of comprehensive planning to provide long term funding, development and integration of educational programs.

This issue is an inevitable result of Issues 1 and 2 and, to some extent, of those which follow. It is both caused and compounded by the facts that educational programming has a relatively low priority within the correctional institution and that it lacks credibility in the eyes of both security and other treatment staff.

Issue 4. Lack of adequate funding.

When an issue common to corrections as a whole, there seems to be some justification for the argument that education may be in need of some additional funding. This appears to be particularly true if the problems of outdate equipment, inappropriate instructional materials, and lack of supportive services are to be addressed.

Issue 5. Diverse sources of "soft" funding.

The number of federal and state agencies which provide funds for correctional education under varied auspices are numerous, so numerous, in fact, that considerable administrative manipulation, time and effort is consumed in seeking them out, fulfilling the requirements, completing proposals and tailoring programs to fit their guidelines. As funds are usually granted for relatively short periods and are subject to change on at least an annual basis, their "soft" status adds considerable uncertainty to administrator, teacher and inmate. They are also often part of a statewide allocation and as such require correctional educators to lobby for their share.

Issue 6 Lack of knowledge of the availability and requirements of funding.

The correctional education administrator is not always knowledgeable about the various sources of funds within state and federal appropriations. If the administrator does have such knowledge she or he may not have the power, the skill, the personnel, or the time to seek out such funds and consequently is restricted to funds allocated to the program under appropriations over which he or she may have no control.

In many ways one cannot help but believe that all these issues hinge upon two facts of life which all associated with vocational education will, I think, admit to:

- First, there are too many funding sources putting not enough money into programs they don't know enough about—thus creating underfunded, short-lived programs which exist without sufficient means to make their success viable;
- Second, there are too many administrators in state and federal government refereeing a game in which they too often change the rules which the players—the vocational educators—have to follow.

Vocational education in corrections comes under the influence of a variety of state and federal legislation. The U.S. Office of Education, Department of Labor, O.E.O., and even good old LEAA all throw money into programs. There are Vocational Education Act money, Basic Education Opportunity grants (BEOA), CETA monies, federally insured loans, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (VRA) student assistance programs, Veterans Benefits and a host of other sources all of which are independent of and often beyond the understanding of most on-site program directors in a specific institution. It is little wonder that such diverse and multiple funding delivery systems are a cause of external conflict when administrators at the state level struggle to disperse them. It is to be expected that there will be a lack of comprehensive planning in the development of vocational education programs. It would appear that due to a saturation of short-term programs, tailored to last only as long as the funding, states and institutions cannot provide a constant effective format in planning and implementing their vocational education programs. In addition, the need to search for, attract, and retain funding often causes the administrator to design programs to meet the availability of funds, creates vocational programs which may lack continuity, and defy most attempts at course sequencing. It frustrates inmate, teacher and administrator alike, as they attempt to adjust to the demands of a particular fiscal year's funding.

An additional funding problem, unique to the area of vocational education, is that vocational training often requires the purchase of "hardware" or expensive and bulky machinery for a majority of course areas. Because of this necessary expenditure, the cost of some programs is formidable, or, if hardware is eventually purchased, the original cost might be a factor in keeping the program in operation longer than the hardware's proven effectiveness or beyond the labor market's demands for such skills. The cost to update equipment is frequently prohibitive.

Therefore, it comes as no surprise that there is a lack of adequate funding. No one can accurately perceive funding needs when so many agencies, without adequate guidelines and policies and with ill-defined target populations, are involved.

It is my belief that until these confusing areas are dealt with then the issues identified in the other areas will remain. I would suggest that we must deal with the problem in the following ways:

- All sources of funds for all education and especially vocational education, must as far as possible be consolidated at least the state level;
- A needs assessment and job market survey in terms of how much, and for what, programs funding should be initiated;
- An attempt to codify all guidelines, program goals and policies be begun;
- A National Clearing House for the dissemination of general information relating to correctional education programs but more particularly information regarding funding be established;
- Comprehensive and integrated plans for the education of inmates be developed in each state. These plans should be developed by teams which include security and treatment personnel. The finished product should be a significant and comprehensive part of the treatment program. It should include adequate funding for programming that involves effective post-release follow-up.

All these suggestions are general. They may be somewhat naive. They certainly require some political action and pressure from the field. It is my belief, however, that until such basic problems relating to the funding and administration of programs are dealt with, all the other issues which I laid out earlier will remain.

THE FUNDING OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR OFFENDERS WHO EXPERIENCE THE CORRECTIONAL PROCESS

by F. Patrick Cronin*

It is my purpose herein to (1) paint a very broad picture of the national legislation that provides the umbrella for the financial support of vocational programs in correctional institutions and (2) describe the various approaches that are being utilized within corrections to deliver these programs.

We must begin by realizing that there is no central agency at the national level that assumes the responsibility for the funding and coordination of vocational education programs within correctional institutions. Many of you as a matter of fact are well aware that during the last decade various federal agencies have assumed different postures at different points in time in providing vocational education funding for offender programs. The policy positions of the national agencies are of course, greatly influenced by the intent of the enabling legislation that requires the agencies to provide services to a wider consumer audience than offenders. J. Clark Essary, Superintendent of Correction's School District No. 428, Illinois Department of Corrections, notes that "the complexity of funding is not unique to the correctional setting, but still is not as simple as one might assume."[1]

A few comments also are in order concerning some of the past history of education and in particular vocational education in state correctional facilities, before we examine the current funding mechanisms that provide vocational education programs for today's offenders.

Historically, during the late 1950's and early 1960's, it was not unusual to find that many educational programs were conducted by "inmate teachers." Many of these programs in structure, resembled traditional public school programs focused primarily upon reading, writing and arithmetic. Bona fide vocational education programs were for the most part, not in existence--although there was claim by some states that inmates were receiving "on the job training" and learning good work habits as a result of their assignment to the institutional maintenance shop or by working in prison industries.

Because of the events surrounding Attica and the resultant turmoil experienced in many state correctional institutions during the late 1960's and continuing on in the 1970's, it was not surprising that governor's task forces were established in a number of states to make recommendations for the improvement of state correctional systems. Then and even now these recommendations by various governor's task forces have included suggestions that correctional personnel seek educational planning assistance from the state educational agency as they considered the design of educational programs for offenders.

---

*F. Patrick Cronin is a Personnel Development Specialist at The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

In 1971, I was privileged to be project director of one of the first state interagency cooperative efforts that had as its primary focus the improvement of vocational education for offenders in a state correctional system. The study, sponsored by the Ohio Division of Vocational Education and the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, examined the current status of vocational education for offenders in seven adult correctional institutions across the state of Ohio.[2] A second focus of the one year effort included site visitation to a number of states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons to review promising approaches for the funding and issues connected with the delivery of vocational education programs to offenders. Specifically, several institutions were visited in correctional systems of the following states: Texas, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Alabama, and Federal Bureau institutions in West Virginia and Kentucky.

A review of the planning strategies for funding vocational programs at that time revealed that a variety of federal and state influences were impacting the direction of programs in the various states. It was not uncommon to find that some state correctional institutions were using funding provided under the provisions of the Rehabilitation Services Act of 1965, and participating in this program through the state vocational rehabilitation agency. Several of the states I visited had developed funding plans utilizing the Manpower Development Training Act Funds as provided by The United States Department of Labor for the delivery of their vocational education. One state, Texas, became the first adult correctional system to establish a "correctional school district" (Windham, 1969). The concept was created with minor modifications from existing Texas legislation and provided umbrella funding for all education programs including vocational education. The establishment of the school district provided the vehicle for formula funding for offender programs on the basis of "average daily attendance" of students the same as any other public school district in Texas.[3] Perhaps the main source of funding for the state correctional system's educational programs, that I observed during this time, was through appropriations provided by the various state legislatures. In many instances, however, line item budgets for educational programs were not built in to the correctional institution's budget.

The latter 60's and early 70's became a time of introspection in many states and educators in corrections began to come to grips with the realization that not enough progress was being made concerning the funding and delivery of bona fide educational opportunities for offenders.

Participants attending this conference, and particularly this session, have a keen interest in the direction of funding trends that will have impact on the planning and design of vocational education programs for adult and youth offenders for the next five to ten years. It is for this reason then that I would like to take the next few minutes to review with you the status of present national funding efforts that provide for the majority of today's offender programs.

Funding from the National Agencies

Presently at the national level, there are a variety of agencies that appear to have an interest in providing support for bona fide vocational education for offenders in penal settings as well as in the community.[4] Examples of current federal legislation citations that delineate such funding and the dissemination of such through national, regional and state planning agencies and state departments of education follow:

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-203, 93rd Congress, S. 1559, Dec. 28, 1973)[5]

It is the purpose of this act, as provided in Section 2, to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed and underemployed persons and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunities and enhance self sufficiency by establishing a flexible and decentralized system of federal, state and local programs.

Comprehensive Manpower Services (Title I)

The act provides that any unit of general local government with a population over 100,000 or more is eligible to be a prime sponsor for manpower employment and training services.

Section 112 provides that 5 percent of Title I funds are to be made for grants for vocational education. "The grants are made to the governors so that they might provide financial assistance through the state boards of vocational education for vocational services in areas served by prime sponsors."

Public Employment Programs (Title II)

This title provides unemployed and underemployed persons with transitional employment in jobs providing needed public services in areas of substantial unemployment.

Special Federal Responsibilities (Title III)

Funds available under this title allow the Secretary of Labor to provide additional manpower services as authorized under Titles I and II and to special manpower target groups to include youth, offenders, persons of limited English-speaking ability, older workers, and other persons having particular disadvantages in the labor market.

More specifically part (c) under Title III, section (c) of Section 301 with respect to programs for offenders referred to in the above statement states: "The secretary shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that participants are provided with such manpower training and related assistance and support services (including basic education, drug addiction or dependency rehabilitation, health care and other services) which will enable them to secure and obtain meaningful employment. To ensure the objectives of this subsection, the secretary may, wherever feasible, provide for appropriate arrangements with employees and labor organization, appropriate parole, probationary and judicial authorities and for the utilization of training equipment comparable to that currently used for the job in which training is furnished."

While CETA indeed provides for support of offender training programs, it would appear that the Department of Labor, while in some instances is continuing the support of programs operations in state correctional agencies, might be shifting its focus. According to Weismann, Chief of Corrections Task Force, Office of Manpower Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, the reason for this shift is because the city and county jails have the largest offender population on any given day than do state prisons.[6]

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-351) as amended[7]

This legislation created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in 1968 and since that time the organization has initiated a national effort to combat crime by giving financial and technical assistance to state and local criminal justice agencies. The act was amended in 1971 and Part E of the act opened the door for the funding of rehabilitation programs in corrections.

Kenneth Carpenter, Chief of Corrections, Office of Regional Operations, suggested in a presentation at The Center for Vocational Education in October 1975 that LEAA since the '71 amendment decided to place the funding focus on "community based programs including probation and parole, halfway houses, group homes, work release, diagnostic services and jail services."[8] During recent years, however, there is also evidence that LEAA has shown growing awareness and concern for the improvement of vocational education programs for offenders in correctional institutions. LEAA funding, for example, has provided such funding at a County Corrections Center in New Jersey, at two state departments of correctional services, and at a West Virginia penitentiary.

As mentioned earlier, LEAA has primarily supported community based programs. While much of this educational funding support has supported higher education, liberal arts programs both inside the correctional institution and as part of study release, there is evidence that offenders have attended vocational education classes on the campuses of several community colleges in Florida and Michigan.[9]

According to Carpenter, "of the amount of funding LEAA has channeled into the correctional area, approximately $75 million has gone into vocational training programs."[8]

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 as Amended

Funding for offender vocational programs also has been provided historically by The Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education of the U.S. Office of Education as provided by the Vocational Education Act of 1963.[10] This act allocating 10 percent of the federal monies supplied to states to vocational education research and teacher training, with special emphasis on the disadvantaged. Thus, corrections and the funding for offender vocational education programs was included under the umbrella of the disadvantaged section of the act.

Still later, "The Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended in 1968, VEA Sections 102b and Part B, mandated OE to allocate funds to the several states for vocational education programs specially targeted to disadvantaged persons."[11]

The Education Act of 1976 (Title II, Vocational Education, Public Law 94-482, October 12, 1976)[12]

This act, specifically for the first time, mentions vocational education programs in corrections. These particular amendments provide the legislative base in sections connected with The National Advisory Council, State Advisory Councils, Research, Vocational Guidance and Counseling and Consumer and Homemaking Education. The following sections provide for possible implications for corrections:

Section 101: Declaration of Purpose

- Improved planning in the use of resources.
- Involvement of wide range of agencies and individuals.
- Extend, improve, and where necessary, maintain existing programs.
- To develop new programs.
- Overcome sex biasing and stereotyping for equal education opportunities.
- Provide part-time employment for students.

Section 105: State Advisory Councils

- Governor shall appoint members of the State Advisory Council on a 3 year term basis.
- Educators must be in the minority on the council.
- Included as one of the twenty representatives should be a person representing state correctional institutions.

Section 124: Residential Vocational Schools

- Funds available for construction, equipment and operation. Provide vocational education, room, board and other necessities. Students must be 15 years old and less than 21 at time training begins. Special consideration given to needs of large urban areas and isolated rural areas with large numbers of school dropouts and unemployed.
- Funds cannot be used for residential schools to which juvenile offenders are assigned.

Section 131: Research

- Projects in development of new careers and occupations, including the fields of mental health, physical health, crime prevention and corrections, welfare education, municipal services, child care, etc.

Section 134: Vocational Guidnace and Counseling

- Not less than 20 percent of funds available for Section 130 (Improvement and Support Services) shall be used to support programs for vocational development guidance and counseling programs and services.
- Counseling for youth offenders and adults in correctional institutions.

Section 150: Consumer and Homemaking Education

- Grants to states may be used in accordance with the five-year and annual state plans for the following purposes:

  Educational programs in Consumer and Homemaking consisting of programs, services and activities at all educationa levels for occupations of homemaking including, but not limited to, consumer education, food and nutrition, family living, parenthood education, child development and guidance, housing and home management, clothing and textiles.

- Encourage outreach programs in communities for youth and adults, giving consideration to special needs, such as, but not limited to, the aged person, young child, school age parents, single parents, handicapped persons, educational disadvantaged persons and programs connected with health care delivery systems and programs providing services for courts and correctional institutions.

Section 162: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

- President shall appoint member to council for a three year term.
- The Council shall consist of 21 members including an individual familiar with the special problems of individuals in correctional institutions.

Funding Through the State and Local Mechanisms

Financing Vocational Education Through the Correctional Institution Budget

One of the most common ways of financing the vocational education programs in the correctional setting is through the correctional institution annual budget. This method of financing apparently is more complicated for correctional institutions and educational planners in providing vocational programs for offenders. The primary difficulty with this funding process has been alluded to by Levy in a national study conducted for the U.S. Department of Labor. Levy indicates "Only 32 percent of the programs by their own admission have adequate modern facilities with all necessary equipment in operable condition." According to Levy, "the reasons these programs are inadequate are lack of financial support and lack of instructional commitment to reintegration through vocational preparation." A further indication of the level of financial support as observed by Levy reveals that "86 percent of the institutions spend less than 10 percent of the total institutional expenditures on vocational training."[13]

The School District Approach

The establishment of the Windham School District in 1969 provided a foundation for vocational educational services to be delivered on a system wide basis to offenders within the Texas Department of Corrections. Since that time, a number of other states have established variations that incorporate the delivery of education through the creation of a targeted school district that provides educational services for offenders. Illinois, Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, Arkansas, and Virginia have established these delivery systems. Although the approaches vary from state to state, they have been established from the enactment of authorizing legislation. This legislation usually contains provisions for a central program, staff and a means of obtaining funds to provide consistent program support. The American Bar Association in 1973 suggested that this approach provided for "(a) a pattern of funding consistent with other educational programs and institutions within the state and (b) the opening up of all normal avenues to federal and state school funds."[14]

Financing Through Community/Technical Colleges

During recent years, the post-secondary community has become interested in providing educational services for offenders both inside the correctional institution as well as on their campus. One of the primary sources for the funding of such programming other than through LEAA and CETA involves Basic Education Opportunity Grants provided under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended.[15]

Examples of funded programs that utilize different funding sources and are currently operating inside correctional institutions and being delivered by community/technical colleges include, from my own observations:

- J.F. Ingram State Technical Institute providing services to offenders of the Draper Correctional Center in Alabama. A second State Technical Institution provides services to inmates of the Holman Unit and G.K. Fountain Correctional Center. (It should be noted that the two technical colleges as originally designed were to provide services exclusively for Alabama's offender population.)

- The Indiana Vocational Technical Institute is providing five vocational programs for offenders in the maximum security facility of the Department of Correction at Michigan City, Indiana.

- Central Arizona Community College offers ten vocational education programs for offenders inside the Arizona State Prisons at Florence. The program was originated in 1969 and operates as a satellite program of the main campus.

- Texarkana Community College provides all of the vocational education programs for offenders inside the Federal Correctional Institution at Texarkana, Texas.

- The State Technical Institute in Memphis, Tennessee is providing five technology courses for offenders of the state correctional facility at Memphis. This program was launched July 1, 1976.

Sylvia McCollum, Education Administrator of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, has suggested that "the allocation of Basic Education Opportunity Grants (BEOG) to incarcerated offenders to finance enrollment in post secondary education programs may well be one of the most significant innovations in recent years."[16]

I would like to close by offering a few comments about the current climate for financing vocational education for offenders. During the middle '70's there has been an emerging awareness by diverse governmental agencies of the need to improve the quality of juvenile and adult offender vocational education programs. The need for coordinated inter-agency planning regarding the financing of vocational education in corrections has been recognized by many leaders across the nation. Inter agency cooperative planning strategies which provide the continuity of systematized funding for quality vocational education for offenders may well be the trend for the future as agencies continue their efforts.

Finally, the need for viable vocational education programs for offenders is included in the telegram message of candidate Jimmy Carter last August in a message delivered to the 106th Congress of the American Correctional Association. It reads as follows:

August 24, 1976

Oliver Keller, President
American Correctional Association
Denver, Colorado

Best wishes on the 106th Congress of the American Correctional Association. A great deal has happened in our country since I met so many of you at your meeting in Atlanta in 1972. While the administration in Washington talked about crime, Ellis McDougal and I worked together to alter dramatically the conditions in Georgia's criminal justice system. The Georgia Bureau of Investigation was upgraded and the Georgia court system simplified and streamlined. Training programs for corrections department personnel grew by four times, inmate education expanded by three times, and vocational program participation grew to six times its former level. I believe that crime is best deterred by the certainty of swift, firm and predictable punishment following conviction. I also believe, as I know you do, that carefully designed and tightly managed rehabilitation programs run by skilled professionals can build new lives for an important segment of our prison population. I hope that in the years ahead we can have an administration in Washington that cares about human problems and trusts our people. Then we can address these issues, with your help, as we were able to do in Georgia.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

References

1. Essary, J. Clark, *Financing Correction's Education,* Adult Leadership, Volume 23, Number 23, June 1975, pp. 367-368.
2. Cronin, F. Patrick et al., *Rehabilitation Education,* Evaluative Research Planning Project in Vocational Education for the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (Project was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare through the Division of Vocational Education, State of Ohio) 1972.
3. Murray, Lane, *The School District Concept,* Adult Leadership, Volume 23, Number 12, June 1975, pp. 358-360.
4. Bell, Raymond, *National Evaluation Program, Phase I, Correctional Education Programs for Inmates: The Issues,* Lehigh University, January 1977, p. 82.
5. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, Public Law 93-203, 93rd Congress, S. 1559, December 28, 1973, p. 19.
6. Weissman, Gary A., *Redefining the Problem,* in Cronin, F. Patric et al., *Workshop for Improving Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions: Proceedings of the Project,* Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1976, pp. 73-81.
7. Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, Public Law 90-351, as amended in 1973 and 1976.
8. Carpenter, Ken, *Is There a Future for Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions Today?,* in Cronin, F. Patrick et al., *Workshop for Improving Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions: Proceedings of the Project,* Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1976, pp. 63-72.
9. Feldman, Sylvia, *Trends in Offender Vocational and Education Programs: A Literature Search with Program Development Guidelines,* Commissioned as part of The American Association of Community and Junior College Project: Offender Assistance Through Community Colleges awarded by the U.S. Office of Education, January 30, 1975.
10. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended.
11. Cornelson, LeRoy et al., *The Federal Role in Vocational Education in Prisons,* developed by the planning staff, Office of the Deputy Commission, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S.O.E., May 17, 1976.
12. Education Act of 1976, Public Law 94-482.
13. Levy, G. W.; Abram, R. A.; and LaDow, D., *Vocational Preparation in U.S. Correctional Institutions: A 1974 Survey,* Report No.: DLMA 89-39-72-01-1, Columbus, Ohio: Batelle Laboratories, December 1975.
14. *Potential of Correctional School District Organizations,* Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, The American Bar Association Coordination, Bulletin No. 22, December 1973.

15. Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended under Public Law 94-482.

16. McCollum, Sylvia, *A Look at Corrections from the Federal Level,* presented at the Correctional Education Association 31st International Conference, University of South Florida, July 12, 1976.

17. Carter, Jimmy, Telegram to Oliver Keller, President, American Correctional Association, delivered to 106th Congress of American Correctional Association, Denver, Colorado, August 24, 1976.

APPROACHES FOR DELIVERING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

by
Mary Ann Evan*
Joan Polk
Larry Salmony

While many questions on the kind of vocational education which should be offered to correctional clients are unanswered, other questions, even more basic, are often not even asked. Should any vocational training be provided at all? And, if so, what administrative structure should be used to deliver these services most effectively and most efficiently?

This paper will address the latter question. It is based on work done by the staff of the Oregon Corrections Education Commission.

There are some references in this paper to agencies, structures, and institutions which are unique to Oregon, but these references can be applied to similar organizations elsewhere.

Criteria for Evaluation Potential Administrative Structures

Eight criteria were established for evaluation of the options available. These criteria are outlined below:

Criterion 1: Program Stigma—the ability of the program to avoid negative labels attached to corrections clients as a subgroups of the general population.

Application of this criterion precludes the creating of programs for creating of programs for corrections education clients that would tend to isolate them further from the regular education community. Therefore, it is necessary that corrections education clients have access to the state's resources in a form that:

- minimizes visibility,
- avoids programs designed exclusively for corrections clients, and
- is equivalent to those offered to the state's general education population.

---

*Presented by Mary Ann Evan, Coordinator of Correctional Education, Oregon State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon.

Criterion II: Credentialing—the ability of the program to negotiate and deliver a comprehensive breadth and scope of legitimized licensing and credentialing.

Credentialing is of critical importance in this society for determining an individual's access to work and economic independence. Credentialing should offer the three following elements:

- Marketability — An evaluation of the marketable value of the education experience and the credential that certifies successful completion.
- Vertical Mobility — The value of the education experience and related certification, in support of future advancement to higher pay, prestige, status, diversity of work, greater responsibility, etc.
- Horizontal Mobility — Breadth of education experience to prepare and credential the individual for work in an entire field rather than more narrowly defined preparation to a particular task.

Many corrections clients suffer gross educational inadequacies with the resultant economic vulnerability. All too frequently, the attempts that are made to educate the prison inmate are accompanied by credentialing that is limited and stigmatized. Limited and stigmatized credentials serve to isolate rather than enhance choice and success.

At the present time, a broad range of credentialing sources and procedures exist in the public education system. These include:

- Secondary system which provides high school diplomas and the GED.
- Proprietary schools which offer certification.
- Apprenticeship training which offers certification and licensing.
- Community college system which offers the broadest range of choices for credentialing including the GED, adult high school diplomas, Vocational and Paraprofessional Certification, AA degrees and access to four-year higher education institutions.
- Four-year higher education system which offers university baccalaureate and graduate and professional degrees.

To maximize the clients' success upon release from incarceration, probation or parole, credentials that compete favorably in the job market are necessary. The delivery system should provide such credentials.

Criterion III: Maximum Use of Existing Education Resources—ability to maximize the use of the state's existing resources for comprehensiveness and flexibility.

Program comprehensiveness is possible if the ability exists to draw upon a wide variety of existing public and/or private education resources. These resources include:

- Instructional Staffs
- Administrative Staffs
- Counseling and Guidance Staffs
- Facilities

Flexibility is necessary to use those resources to meet the educational, psychological and social needs of the widely divergent client population on an individual or group basis.

The access to existing education facilities is necessary both for those clients who are incarcerated and those on probation or parole. The development of mechanisms that will allow for the use, by incarcerated clients, of existing community college and higher education facilities, is preferable to constructing facilities within the institutions to duplicate existing resources. Probation and parole clients are in the community and are in a much better position to take advantage of existing resources. Additional special facilities for this relatively small number of students would be costly and clearly duplicative.

Criterion IV: Education System Impact—the program potential for becoming an established part of the existing education system.

For realizing success it is necessary that corrections education programs become an established part of the state's education system. The education community must be committed to the state's responsibility to educate all of its citizens and be prepared to fulfill this commitment with whatever resources it is capable of delivering. Without total commitment, the programs will enjoy no political advocacy. The result is a tentativeness and vulnerability that preclude success.

Criterion V: Corrections Input—the ability to maximize education opportunity for corrections clients that is compatible with present and/or future correctional policy.

With one exception—that is, maintaining programs as they presently exist—all of the administrative structures being considered would probably require adjustments in policy in the Corrections Division. What is in question here is the degree of control and input that the Corrections Division will have if the existing structure is to be altered.

Criterion VI: Potential for Community-based Corrections Education—the ability to meet the changing clients' needs based on nationwide trends toward community-based corrections systems.

The current trend in corrections policy is to provide community-based corrections facilities and rehabilitation efforts. An administrative structure for corrections education programs is needed that is compatible with this trend. This requires statewide education resources and facilities and access to corrections education clients.

Criterion VII: Financial Consideration—the ability to draw upon sources of funding adequate for initiating and maintaining corrections education programs.

A wide variety of funding sources for education programs is available and should be carefully considered when weighing the advantages and disadvantages of one potential administrative structuring over another. A structure should be selected which is capable of negotiating and delivering maximum funding support for corrections education programs.

Criterion VIII: Evaluative Mechanisms—the ability of the administrative structure to facilitate the evaluation of corrections education programs.

Administrative responsibility for corrections education programs requires built-in mechanism for evaluation. In order to deliver education services that are responsive to the needs of the client, continuing evaluation in three areas is necessary.

- Program Performance Evaluation: A first level of evaluation consists of program accountability. Are the programs doing what they set out to do, i.e., serving number of clients, providing specified hours of instruction, etc.?

- Effectiveness Evaluation: A second concern in evaluation has to do with the effectiveness of the activities undertaken. Are the programs producing the outcomes desired? Such evaluations are amenable to the utilization of traditional experimental designs, which seek to establish the degree to which the given activity has brought about an improvement in specified performance criteria.

- Continuing Needs Assessment: Client and staff needs must be continually assessed in order to make decisions for development of new programs. New programs should evolve out of a systematic evaluation and review process which helps to identify needs.

Alternative Structures

Twelve structures were identified as options to be considered. While other possibilities may exist, this paper will be confined to the following alternatives:

- operation by Education Coordinating Council,
- operation by Vocational Rehabilitation Division,
- assimilation by the local school district,
- establishment of an independent commission,
- assimilation by a community college,
- creation of an independent community college,
- creation of a special school district,
- operation by State Board of Higher Education,
- operation by State Board of Education,
- establishment of a semi-autonomous commission,
- operation by Division of Continuing Education, and
- continuation of existing structure within the Corrections Division.

Application of Criteria

Several of these options were eliminated when the criteria were applied. The discussion that follows deals with the structures as they exist in Oregon. It should be noted that different states may have other results when considering the same administrative structure because of organizational variations.

1. Operation of corrections education programs by the Educational Coordinating Council. One of the primary purposes of the Education Coordinating Council is to adjudicate the inevitable conflicts arising among education agencies and institutions in the state. In order to do this, the Council must remain a neutral arbiter. The Council's responsibility is to provide policy research for those agencies that have vested interests in education in the state. Providing on-line services would vitiate the neutrality necessary to adjudicate conflicts between other agencies in the state who provide educational services. If the Council were to be given responsibility for administering corrections education programs, it would mean a loss to the state of its only neutral independent educationa gency. For this reason, the Education Coordinating Council was eliminated.

2. Operation of corrections education programs by the Vocational Rehabilitation Division. The purpose of the Vocational Rehabilitation Division is to assist those persons who are physically, mentally, emotionally and socially handicapped. The basic eligibility requirements for acquiring services from this agency include:

   - a disabling condition as defined by the Division,
   - causes of disability that can be alleviated by services from the Division, and
   - reasonable expectation that the individual will eventually become self-supporting.

   In order to receive education services from the Vocational Rehabilitation Division, corrections clients would, for the most part, be defined as socially handicapped, or more definitively, possessing "behavior pattern disorder." Counselors would then write education plans for the client and funding for realizing these plans would be provided through the Vocational Rehabilitation Division. The Division coordinates the use of education resources already existing in the state, and funds participation on an individual basis. Given the guidelines and objectives under which the Vocational Rehabilitation Division currently operates, it is unlikely that it could successfully administer education programs for corrections clients for the following reasons:

   - Financial difficulties – the Division is required to apply stringent guidelines in determining clients who qualify as "behavior pattern disorder" clients.
   - Education commitment – the Division, at this time, does not have the specific educational expertise necessary to deliver adequate corrections education programs.
   - Compounding stigma – It would not be desirable to apply the "behavior pattern disorder" stigma to the already labeled corrections client.

3. Assimilation by the local school district. The local school district is responsible for providing education services for grades 1 through 12 inside specified geographical boundaries. Correctional institutions located within those boundaries could be legally considered within the jurisdiction of the Salem School District. Corrections education programs could conceivably be administered by the district, but for several reasons this alternative has been eliminated:

   - Program Stigma – The range of ages of corrections clients is greater than that of the school district population. Although some of the education needs of these two groups are similar, the services are directed toward a younger population in general.

- Services specifically designed for adult populations with the public image that accompanies adult programs would be more beneficial. The client would not be burdened with the stigma, real or imagined, of having to relate to what might be publicly perceived as a program for children.

- Limited Resources – This alternative does not lend itself to a comprehensive use of the state's resources, such as community colleges and institutions of higher education. This potentially limits curriculum and staffing as well as the flexibility necessary to serve this diverse population.

- Community-based Corrections – This alternative does not lend itself to accommodating the trend in corrections toward community-based corrections systems, since clients may be located in any school district throughout the state.

4. Creation of an Independent Commission. An independent commission could be given responsibility by legislative mandate to administer corrections education programs. Ideally, the commission would include members representing the education community, the correctional system, related state agencies, and political interests. The commission could contract on a needs basis for all services from public and private education resources in the state.

   Although there are advantages to implementing this alternative, its disadvantages are greater and at times ironically intertwined with its strengths. Some strengths are:

   - Flexibility – An independent commission is unbeholden to any one educational institution and could contract from any of the state's resources for the best services available.

   - Corrections Input – Positions on the commission would be created to assure formal policy input from the Corrections Division.

   - Community-based Corrections Systems – This alternative could enhance the trend in the state toward community-based corrections systems and could respond to changes in the system.

   - Political Visibility – A potential advantage of an independent commission is its ability to demand political recognition, and hence financial support and a visibility that demands responsiveness from the state's education institutions.

   On the other hand, this alternative has several disadvantages:

   - Stigma – Political visibility, listed above as a strength, is conversely one of this alternative's major weaknesses. It is undesirable that a group representing a corrections constituency be publicly visible due to the stigma necessarily attaching itself to the programs as a result. Although the political support might be present the potential labeling should be avoided.

   - Additional Bureaucracy – The addition of a large structure to administer corrections education programs is cumbersome, costly and duplicative.

   - Institutional Backing – One of the major reasons for eliminating this alternative is its potential political vulnerability and the resulting consequences for corrections education programs. An independent commission does not have the institutional support necessary for assuring that corrections education programs will become an established part of the state's existing education system. This suggests a tentative and vulnerable administrative structure; hence, tentative and vulnerable corrections education programs.

5. Assimilation by a community college. The jurisdiction of each community college is defined by geographical boundaries, and property taxes are levied within those boundaries to support each of the institutions, supplemented by some state funds. Each college is responsible for providing access to its services to any adult citizen residing within its specified boundaries. If a corrections institution is located within a community college district, its inmates might be considered as residents of that district. This alternative has been considered seriously because it lends itself to the logical placing of responsibility upon an institution that may already have an obligation in this area.

   However, careful consideration suggests that this alternative is unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

   - Institution Stigma – It is unfair to expect one institution to provide for the education needs of the total incarcerated corrections population. The inevitable stigma applied to that institution would diminish its effectiveness for all of its students and would negate any gain for corrections clients.

   - Limited Options – Locking into one institution is limiting and precludes providing a diversity of academic and vocational training and offerings. Resources from one community college cannot provide the comprehensive range of options necessary for the corrections client population.

   - Limits Community-based Possibilities – This alternative does not lend itself to trends toward community-based corrections systems throughout the state.

6. Creation of an independent community college. The creation of an independent community college specifically for the providing of education services to corrections clients would require approval from the State Board of Education as well as legislative mandate. This alternative has been rejected for several reasons:

   - Administrative Costs – The creation of a separate education identity is unnecessary. The administrative staffing that would be necessary represents a cost that is excessive and duplicative.

   - Maximum Use of Resources – Creating a separate institution that does not make use of existing resources is not cost-effective.

   - Stigma – Separating correction education programs from the state's legitimate education institutions is a situation that already exists in the present delivery system. An independent community college would offer a new name perhaps, but unavoidable labeling of programs and credentialing is the inevitable result.

   - Isolation of Clients – This alternative would serve to isolate the corrections client. Even though approval and accreditation would be offered through the State Board, all students in this community college would be corrections clients. This is indefensible given the assumption that education should serve to enhance the incarcerated client's rehabilitation and chances of success in the outside community.

7. Creation of a special school district. This is an administrative alternative for delivering corrections education programs that is becoming increasingly popular throughout the country. The major reason for selecting this alternative, and a legitimate one, seems to be that it makes available some funding that is not available to departments of corrections for education programs. Creating an additional school district, subject to state requirements and accreditation, is a means of assuring that a state meet its responsibility to educate all of its citizens, including those citizens who are incarcerated or on release. It would, in all probability, also improve the quality of education that is delivered, in any areas in which current programs are not comparable to those offered in the public education system.

   However, there are difficulties with this alternative and it is recommended in this study that corrections education programs in Oregon not adopt this alternative. Most of the reasons for rejecting the creation of a special school district are the same as those noted for eliminating the above independent community college alternative. These include:

   - Administrative Costs
   - Maximum Use of Resources
   - Stigma
   - Isolation of Clients
   - Funding Difficulties – A statewide tax base for funding a special school district would have to be created. It cannot be assumed that the financial advantage that results would be substantially greater than that which is already provided for corrections education programs. Federal funding now restricted to school districts would be available to corrections education, but could be offset by loss of some federal monies now available to correctional programs.
   - Program Stigma – As was noted in the discussion regarding assimilation by the local school district, programs for adults should be developed in a setting which is adult.

8. Operation of corrections education programs by the State Board of Higher Education. The State Board of Higher Education operates state-supported four-year institutions of higher learning, and state-supported professional schools.

   In addition, the Board also oversees the Division of Continuing Education which is a self-supporting unit and administers a diversified program of university adult education and community services throughout the state. The three primary functions of the State System of Higher Education are:

   - to provide higher education instruction,
   - to conduct research, and
   - to extend resources for public service.

It is conceivable that the Board of Higher Education could administer corrections education programs. However, it is not the Board's responsibility to provide the kind of services needed by the majority of corrections clients. Higher education services do not include adult basic education or the range of vocational-paraprofessional training and certification at the necessary levels. Although the Board of Higher Education could contract for these services, there is no substantial reason for making that request.

There is substantial reason, however, for building into an administrative structure for corrections education programs the commitment by the Board to programs that will require the use of higher education resources in the state. This will include those corrections clients who are incarcerated or on release who need access to higher education resources as well as corrections staff who require ongoing training in their professions. The public four-year institutions are the state's primary resources for extending higher education and graduate studies to corrections clients and corrections staff. Resources and facilities are dispersed statewide and considerable funding allocations come from state and federal sources for public education purposes. However, the State System of Higher Education is best equipped and has the responsibility to respond to the higher education needs of corrections staff and clients and should continue to do so under any administrative structuring.

Extensive Analysis of Selected Alternatives

Several of the options for administrative structures appeared in Oregon to be especially appropriate. These options are considered here in greater detail.

9. Operation of corrections education programs by the Division of Continuing Education. The Division of Continuing Education is a self-supporting unit of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. The Division administers a diversified program of university adult education community services throughout the state. Regional offices are located throughout the state, and contact with the Division of Continuing Education can also be made through most school districts.

   College and high school credit level study is arranged through the Division. Credit is given upon successful completion of examinations. An extensive education film and materials library exists in addition to special instructional systems, publications, motion pictures, tape recordings, slides, all materials under contract with individuals, agencies and institutions. Most instruction is provided by regular members of college and university staffs, approved by accredited institutions and hired by the Division on a part-time temporary basis. Hiring of full-time instruction staff is avoided. This allows the Division to offer instruction based on community or individual need rather than locking in to a faculty that might not be capable of delivering needed services. Previously developed criteria are applied to the Division of Continuing Education, with these results:

   ### Criterion I — Program Stigma

   Labeling and stigma are not inherent in the Division of Continuing Education programs. In addition, the Division of Continuing Education has the ability to contract from a wide variety of sources that are not labeled and stigmatized. However, as with any of the alternatives, special programs created by the Division of Continuing Education for corrections clients may acquire a stigma.

Criterion II -- Credentialing

The Division of Continuing Education has the ability to:

- provide credit toward credentials, but not the credentials themselves.
- coordinate and negotiate delivery of unstigmatized credentials.

Criterion III -- Maximum Use of Resources

The Division of Continuing Education has the ability to:

- deliver a comprehensive range of offerings from public and private sources statewide, including proprietary schools, higher education institutions (public and private) and community colleges.
- meet the needs of a widely divergent population by coordinating statewide education resources for clients on probation/parole as well as the continuing education of law enforcement personnel.
- coordinate administrative contacts statewide at civil service level salaries.
- use facilities throughout state, i.e., public and private schools, business facilities, churches, state offices, etc.

Criterion IV -- Education System Impact

The Division of Continuing Education has the ability to:

- create new programs as well as integrate clients into established education systems.
- coordinate statewide education resources, a necessity for establishing corrections education release programs as part of existing education systems.

However, because the Division of Continuing Education is self-supporting, the Division is politically vulnerable. This could jeopardize a corrections program if the Division of Continuing Education was unable to maintain the necessary support and commitment from the state's funding sources and the education community.

Criterion V -- Corrections Input

Formal administrative links would have to be established to assure Corrections Division input. Any administrative structuring, including this one, would of course have to address the potential conflicts between corrections policy and education policy where interfaces exist.

Criterion VI -- Potential for Community-based Education

The Division of Continuing Education has the ability to:

- meet client needs by accommodating trends toward community-based corrections systems with its access to statewide resources and contacts.

- address more effectively that other alternatives the educational needs of probation/ parole clients due to its statewide resources and contacts.

Criterion VII – Financial Considerations

Funding for corrections education programs, if administered by the Division of Continuing Education, would come primarily through the State General Fund and through federal funding for corrections programs.

Student Financial Aid is not available at this time to support students taking courses for Division of Continuing Education credit.

Criterion VIII – Evaluative Mechanisms

The Division of Continuing Education functions on the basis of ongoing assessment of needs and therefore can offer programs which can be evaluated.

10. Continuation of the present system, with programs operated by the Corrections Division. The Corrections Division provides general administration for state correctional facilities and, in Oregon, for parole and probation services as well. The Division also works with the State Law Enforcement Council and other agencies to develop community programs for misdemeanants and selected felons.

The Oregon Corrections Division presently provides Adult Basic Education, Vocational Training and Higher Education programs within the correctional facilities, and education release opportunities for a number of its clients. These programs are now supported entirely,by the Corrections Division through general fund appropriations and special state and federal grants.

Application of the criteria to the present system gives the following results:

Criterion I – Program Stigma

Programs operated by the correctional system within its confines necessarily involve the stigma of being associated with corrections. Without a greater commitment from the state's education community for delivery of its services to corrections clients, stigmatized and labeled programs are impossible to avoid.

Criterion II -- Credentialing

Given the limited access to the state's education resources as well as restrictions inherent in confining programs to limited facilities, corrections education programs have difficulty negotiating and delivering a comprehensive breadth and scope of legitimized licensing and credentialing.

Criterion III – Maximum Use of Existing Resources

The Corrections Division is not now, in structure or staffing, equipped to negotiate utilization of existing educational resources for its clients. The complexity of this problem is due in part to a lack of central coordination of the various educational resources in the state.

Criterion IV – Education System Impact

Corrections Division education programs have little chance of becoming an established part of the existing education system. Certification of new education programs is usually an arduous process requiring years of work and a great amount of staff time. Additionally, these changes must be done within the organizational structure and budgeting process of the Division.

Criterion V – Corrections Input

An administrative structuring for corrections education programs must address itself to Corrections Division policy and the inevitable conflicts that will exist between custodial responsibility and the responsibility for delivering education programs. The question to be considered here is whether the educational interests of the clients can be adequately represented when there is a conflict between custodial demands and educational needs, if total program responsibility lies within the Corrections Division.

Criterion VI – Potential for Community-based Corrections Education

There is minimal potential for adequate education programs to meet client needs in community-based corrections systems due to limited access to the state's education resources, i.e., financial, instructional, credentialing, facilities, administrative staffing. Additional education-oriented staff would be required to negotiate for such services throughout the state.

Criterion VII – Financial Considerations

Corrections Division education programs do not have access to:

- general fund appropriations equated with state's education system funding.
- federal funding resources comparable to secondary, Community College and Higher Education sources of funding.

Without adequate funding, corrections education programs cannot function successfully. An administrative structure for these programs must address itself to this difficulty and be capable of negotiating and delivering the necessary funding.

Criterion VIII – Evaluative Mechanisms

Existing Corrections Division education programs do not provide adequate ongoing evaluation of programs. Funding has not been available to provide the additional staffing or contracted services which would be required.

11. Operation of corrections education programs by the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education is responsible for planning and evaluating public elementary, secondary and community college education. It sets broad, general policies to guide the operation of local school and community college districts. It decides on priority objectives for the educational system in grades kindergarten through 14. The Board authorizes state courses of study, adopts rules for the general government of public schools, establishes state standards for public schools, and negotiates any contracts for agreements on behalf of the state for

receipt of federal funds for educational purposes. The Board of Education staff, headed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, exercises all administrative functions relating to supervision and management of public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges not conferred by law on some other agency. Furthermore, the State Board of Education in Oregon is required by law to provide and assure access to its education services to all citizens of the state.

When the criteria are applied to the State Board of Education, results are as follows:

Criterion I – Program Stigma

The State Board has the ability to integrate corrections clients into already existing programs in communities throughout the state. This alleviates the possibility of any one institution becoming over-balanced with this subgroup of the population with resulting stigmatization of that institution. The State Board might also create special programs for corrections clients. This method, as previously stated, would involve a stigma for corrections clients.

Criterion II – Credentialing

The State Board of Education has the ability to provide access to a broad range of credentialing and licensing through its secondary and community college systems. These credentials would be marketable and unstigmatized. Again, this advantage would be lost if special programs were developed for corrections clients.

Criterion III – Maximum Use of Resources

The State Board has access to the state's broadest range of resources necessary for corrections client education including instruction, counseling and guidance, and administrative staffs and facilities. Most of these needed resources are part of the state's existing secondary and community college systems.

Criterion IV – Education System Impact

The State Board of Education has the greatest potential of the twelve alternatives for assuring that corrections education programs become an established part of the state's education system. This potential, however, could be realized only through an appropriate legislative mandate given and accompanying funding for implementation.

Criterion V – Corrections Input

As with the Division of Continuing Education, formal linkages would need to be established to negotiate conflicts and come to some resolution.

Criterion VI – Potential for Community-based Education

The State Board of Education has the potential ability for meeting the corrections clients' changing needs based on trends toward community-based corrections systems. The community college system, in particular, could be coordinated to meet this new demand.

Criterion VII – Financial Considerations

The State Board has the ability to draw upon a wide range of funding sources: federal, state and local. This alternative provides direct access to those funding sources. It is necessary that those sources be available to corrections clients if adequate education programs are to be realized.

Criterion VIII – Evaluative Mechanisms

One of the major functions of the Board is evaluation of needs and programs and an evaluation component is built into its administrative structure. This component could easily be expanded to encompass corrections programs.

12. Creation of a semi-autonomous commission. The creation of a semi-autonomous commission to administer corrections education programs has strengths and weaknesses similar to those of the independent commission.

The advantages of the semi-autonomous commission over the independent commission are:

- budget support – Funding would be accessible through the budget of the agency under which the commission was housed, i.e., Corrections Division, State Board of Education, or other agency.
- access to resources – The commission would have access to the resources of the agency under which it was housed, and to those resources represented by positions on the commission.

Application of the criteria to this option results in these findings:

Criterion I – Program Stigma

A commission has the ability to avoid stigma depending upon where it is housed. Its placement also determined the resources to which it has access.

Criterion II – Credentialing

A commission has the ability, depending upon where it is housed, to offer a breadth and scope of legitimized credentialing.

Criterion III – Maximum Use of Resources

As with Criteria I and II, the location and make-up of the commission would determine the extent to which it could utilize existing resources.

Criterion IV – Education System Impact

This alternative has the potential for assuring that correction education programs become an established part of the existing education programs placed within the education community.

Criterion V – Corrections Input

A semi-autonomous commission could insure corrections input either as a result of placement of the commission or the provision of positions on the commission specified for corrections input.

Criterion VI – Potential for Community-based Education

This alternative does not lend itself readily to meeting client needs based in community-based corrections systems, unless care is taken to insure that commission membership represents this interest.

Criterion VII – Financial Considerations

Strategically housed, the commission would have access to the state's financial education resources for corrections education programs, which are not accessible to these programs at this time.

Criterion VIII – Evaluative Mechanisms

If the evaluation mechanisms are developed initially, evaluation under this option could become part of the corrections education system.

Conclusion

In the State of Oregon, a semi-autonomous commission was established. Its membership includes representatives of the Corrections Division, the State Department of Education, the State System of Higher Education, the Employment Division, and the community colleges. The responsibility for planning the corrections education program and delivery system is vested in the State Department of Education. The planning process is carried out by the commission (called the Joint Corrections Education Planning and Development Team) staffed by Department of Education personnel. The Corrections Division retains operational responsibility.

Oregon's solution was of course dictated by Oregon's situation. It is hoped, however, that the methodology applied here might be useful in other systems as well.

SECTION FOUR:

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL AND TECHNOLOGY FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

- Information Retrieval Systems and Corrections
- The Future for Technology in Vocational Education in Corrections

INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS:
WHO NEEDS THEM?

by Paul E. Schroeder*

The question which is the topic of this paper is indeed a very interesting and perplexing one. Perhaps the easiest way to deal with it is to answer "You need today or will need in the near future, information retrieval systems to assist you in performing your work in a more comprehensive, effective, and efficient manner than you do now without such systems."

Why do we need information systems? Because we are a nation, a world, and a profession which constantly creates and uses large quantities of information in one form or another. Therefore, it seems logical that we need the assistance of a systemized way of collecting, storing and disseminating these various kinds and forms of information to save us from each having to perform those functions. If each person had to search for, collect, and store the wide variety of information we work with, we would probably not have time to ever use that information.

Let us not spend any more time on discussing the philosophical aspects or rationale for information systems. Instead, let's discuss what systems, currently in operation, might be of assistance to you who are interested in information dealing with vocational education, corrections, and vocational education in corrections.

The following is a list of acronyms for several information systems which deal with the topics just mentioned. How many of them can you identify and what does each system provide for you?

- ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)
  - RIE (Resources in Education – a publication of ERIC)
  - CIJE (Current Index to Journals in Education – a publication of ERIC)
- AIM/ARM (Abstracts of Instructional and Research Materials in Vocational and Technical Education)
  - RVE (Resources in Vocational Education – a publication of AIM/ARM)
- NNCCV-TE (National Network for Curriculum Coordination in Vocational-Technical Education)
- RCU (Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education)

---

*Paul E. Schroeder is a Specialist at The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

SSIE (Smithsonian Science Information Exchange)

NICEM (National Information Center for Educational Media)

DIALOG (A trade name of the Lockheed Information Sciences computerized data base system)

NCJRS (National Criminal Justice Reference Service)

LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration)

NCCJIS (National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Information Systems)

NCCJPA (National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture)

Briefly, let us describe what each system can provide for you. Keep in mind that these systems are document oriented. That is, most of them search for, collect, process, store, announce availability, and make available in many instances copies of reports, books, instructional materials, etc.—documents. A few of the systems, namely the RCU's NNCCU-TE, LEAA, NCCJIS, NCCJPA, and DIALOG do not deal primarily with documents other than their own publications. They do, however, provide referral, technical assistance, and at-cost services which are generally not part of the services of the other "information systems."

Keep in mind that we are talking about document and referral/technical assistance information systems. We won't discuss data or management information system which exist in abundance anywhere you look. Such systems include manpower data like the Bureau of Labor Statistics and state "job data banks." These type of systems, manual or computerized, are also valuable tools in your work. But our purpose here is to highlight those information systems which can probably bring you, from national and international sources, information, in document form about vocational education in corrections.

Abstracts of Instruction and Research Materials in Vocational and Technical Education

In an effort to make information regarding relevant instructional and research materials (in-use and under development) in vocational and technical education accessible to those who can use these materials to improve education, The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, Ohio, produces a publication entitled *Abstracts of Instructional and Research Materials in Vocational and Technical Education* (AIM/ARM), recently renamed *Resources in Vocational Education.*

This publication covers a wide range of areas in vocational and technical education: agricultural education, business and office education, distributive education, health occupations education, home economics education, consumer education, industrial arts education, trade and industrial education, and related fields, such as manpower economics, occupational guidance, and occupational rehabilitation. Basically, the users of AIM/ARM are associated with one of the above mentioned areas and include researchers, teachers, curriculum specialists, administrators, planners, students and counselors, as well as business and industry managers.

Each bi-monthly issue of AIM/ARM contains the following sections: Abstracts, Subject Index, Author Index, and Projects in Progress. The "Abstracts" section presents information about authors, titles, availability, and the content of documents. Information of this nature can help the reader determine if he or she wants to read the full text of the document. If more in-depth information is desired, copies of full texts of most documents are available through the AIM/ARM Microfiche Sets.

The "Subject Index" lists subject descriptors which conform to those listed in the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors*. The purpose of the index is to help the user locate abstracts of documents relevant to his or her information needs. The subjects in this index are listed alphabetically, with VT accession numbers listed in numerical order under each subject heading.

The "Author Index" lists documents under the name(s) of their author(s). It is arranged in alphabetical order by the person's last name and/or the institutions full name. Document abstracts appear in numerical order under the name of each author and/or institution.

A section in AIM/ARM entitled "Projects in Progress" announces in-progress research and curriculum development projects funded by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-576), Parts C, D, and I. Abstracts in this section (with VTP accession numbers) help to keep the reader aware of ongoing research and curriculum development projects and activities in vocational education. Contributors of materials for announcement in AIM/ARM include local school districts, state departments of education, curriculum materials laboratories, professional associations, industrial organizations, U.S. Office of Education, private foundations, and other organizations.

Aerospace Education Foundation

The Aerospace Education Foundation (AEF) is a non-profit organization located at 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The primary purpose of the organization is to apply aerospace technology to the advancement of education. In doing so, AEF has as one of its tasks the determination and dissemination of those U.S. Air Force vocational-technical training materials applicable for civilian school use.

Under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, AEF screened Air Force training materials to identify those adaptable for immediate civilian use. The product of this effort was a publication entitled *Inventory of U.S. Air Force Vocational Course Materials for Possible Adaptation to the Civilian School Systems*. This publication is a 228-page catalog which documents 82 Air Force instructional systems, covers 24 occupational career areas, and represents more than 26,000 hours of instruction. An index listing the occupational areas and the occupations within each is also available.

In 1972, seven Air Force courses were selected for pilot testing in selected civilian schools. The seven courses selected were "Auto/Truck Mechanic," "Nurse's Aide," "Medical Service Fundamental," "Food Inspector," "Structural Engineering Assistant," "Aircraft Maintenance Fundamental," and "Apprentice Carpenter." Each course package contains the following: (1) all printed materials on microfiche or in printed form (the total number of hours and cost for microfiche and hard copy versions of materials are made available for each course); (2) a "Plan of Instruction;" (3) a complete set of lesson plans for each instructional system--microfiche or print format; (4) a summary of key elements in each system, including a list of essential equipment; and (5) audio/visual "Materials Availability Summary," which lists titles, prices, and sources for the visuals used in each system.

In late 1973, an eight instructional course/system, "Electronic Principles," was added. The content of the electronics course ranges from basic electrical concepts through microwave principles. The course is comprised of ten modules (blocks) and the modules are available on an individual basis for the cost of assembling, reproducing, and disseminating the course materials.

The National Laboratory for the Advancement of Education (NLAE), a division in the Aerospace Education Foundation, makes all course or system packages available at a cost-plus-handling fee to interested secondary and post-secondary schools, education departments, other institutions, corporations, and private individuals. Subject to availability, NLAE provides a preview package of any one block of instruction of the requester's choice. The preview package consists of the Plan of Instruction, all printed materials, and one sample of the TV programs in the block. No slides are available for preview. Additional information and inquiries should be addressed to NLAE in care of the Aerospace Education Foundation.

American Council on Education

The American Council on Education (ACE), located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., is considered the nation's major coordinating body for post-secondary education. It is composed of institutions of higher education and regional and national associations. Its primary function is to provide leadership for improvement of educational standards, policies, and procedures.

The Office of Educational Credit (OEC), the Council's division concerned with educational credit policies and practices in post-secondary institutions, has as its purposes (1) evaluation of military educational programs, (2) assisting educators in making credit decisions on such program experiences, and (3) administration of the General Educational Development (GED) Testing Service. Beneficiaries of the Council's services usually include admissions officials of secondary and post-secondary institutions, colleges, universities, state departments, civil service commissions, business and industry employers, and others who assess the applicability of a veterans' or service persons' military training to a selected program of study at the institution or agency.

As a part of its services, the Council has periodically provided (since 1946) a publication entitled *Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services.* The "Guide" includes a listing of formal courses offered by the Department of Defense and the branches of the Armed Services, with recommendations for equivalent credit in post-secondary education categories. More specifically, the 1974 edition of the "Guide" has included courses for possible credit in the vocational, technical, baccalaureate, and graduate categories. Future editions of the "Guide" are to be published annually as a new edition or as a supplement, with the intent of better serving the needs of students, the military, and educational institutions or agencies. As an additional advisory service, after the publication of each edition of the "Guide" OEC will continue to receive and review new and revised programs of instruction. Recommendations for these programs are provided upon request.

As for format, the 1974 edition includes the following sections: Course Exhibits, Appendix, Keyword Index, and Course Number Index. An Office of Educational Credit identification number (OEC I.D. number) is listed for each course in the "Guide." Prefix initials precede each OEC I.D. number to indicate the branch of the Armed Services offering the course. For example, AF-1234-5678 indicates the following: (1) the initial "AF" indicates the Air Force as the branch offering the course, (2) the first four numbers codify the subject matter covered in the course—USOE definitions for all subject-matter codes are listed in the appendix, and (3) the last four numbers assign a unique number to each course within a given subject-matter code and within a given branch of the service. The format for each course listed in the Course Exhibits section (excluding the OEC I.D. number) is as follows: training program title, military course number, location, length, dates offered, course objectives, instructional description, and a credit recommendation.

The Council's publication gives an excellent list of military courses for which curriculum materials may be available from the military service listed.

Curriculum Coordination Centers

Presently, Curriculum Coordination Centers (CCCs) are located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Mississippi, and Washington, representing the western, east central, northeast, midwest, southeast and northwestern regional centers, respectively. Curriculum Coordination Centers are federally funded and designed to serve the entire field of vocational and technical education, especially those educators directly involved in curriculum endeavors. The primary purpose of the CCCs is to coordinate curriculum development, dissemination, utilization, and evaluation activities within their regions. Liaison and coordination efforts are maintained with groups such as teacher education programs, local education agencies, state research coordinating units, professional organizations, the two national centers on vocational and technical education, and other agencies. The number of states included in each regional center varies, and a liaison person is available from each state.

Each center makes a list of curriculum materials available to each of the other five centers for distribution to affiliated states. The list contains those materials that are in the planning and development stages within projects as well as those already published. As an external service, the centers also make abstracts of curricula that are underway in its respective region available to The Center for Vocational Education in Columbus, Ohio, for inclusion in a special section of the AIM/ARM publication entitled "Projects in Progress."

Dissertation Abstracts International

Dissertation Abstracts is a standard reference work for researchers interested in the research of scholars who have received their doctoral degrees.

Published monthly, the abstracts come in two volumes, Section A covering dissertations in the humanities and social sciences, and Section B devoted to the sciences and engineering.

Each section contains a subject and author index to the 600 word abstracts describing the doctoral research work reported in dissertations.

Abstracted dissertations which interest the reader may be purchased in their entirety in xerographic or microfilm copy for keeping abreast of the well over 30,000 doctoral dissertation research activities occurring each year.

A computerized search service called DATRIX II provides, at cost, a rapid and efficient means of searching for information in the Abstract's data file of more than 430,000 titles.

Further information about Dissertation Abstracts can be obtained from your local college or university library or directly from: Xerox University Microfilms, 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, phone: (313) 761-4700.

Educational Resources Information Center

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), with central headquarters located in Washington, D.C., is a nationwide information system designed to quickly provide significant information (technical and research reports, speeches, conference papers, curriculum and teacher guides, and the like) to the education community. The central headquarters coordinates the efforts of sixteen ERIC Clearinghouses with locations in universities and professional organizations throughout the United States. The purpose of each clearinghouse is to search for, acquire, select, abstract, index, store, retrieve, and disseminate significant information as related to its particular area (e.g., the ERIC Clearinghouse on Career Education acquires and processes that information related to Career Education and related fields). In addition, each clearinghouse publishes and disseminates special reports, literature reviews, summaries, state-of-the-art papers, and the like. Some clearinghouses provide Current Awareness Services to their immediate users. Teachers, students, administrators, researchers, librarians, and others interested in educational literature reap the benefits of ERIC products and services.

As a service to those interested in research endeavors, ERIC provides a monthly publication entitled *Resources in Education* (RIE). Every issue of RIE contains indexes (subject, author, institution) and resumes of every document processed in one of the clearinghouses. Included as a part of each resume is standard information, such as accession number (ED number), author, title, publication date, descriptors and identifiers, price, availability, descriptive note, abstract, and other information useful to the reader.

In order to service more practitioners in education and not limit its services to the research-oriented users, ERIC also provides a publication entitled *Current Index to Journals in Education* (CIJE). This is a monthly, annotated index of articles in over 750 education-related journals. CIJE is organized similarly to RIE (but with an EJ accession number) and includes a Main Entry Section, Subject Index, Author Index, and Journal Contents Index.

The *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors* controls the terminology of ERIC. Documents available through ERIC are obtainable in microfiche or xerographic paper copy form. Documents announced in RIE are obtainable, upon demand or subscription, from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS).

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Career Education*
Ohio State University
Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Telephone: (614) 486-3655

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Counseling and Personnel Services*
University of Michigan
School of Education Building, Room 2108
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Telephone: (313) 764-9492

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Urban Education*
Columbia University, Teachers College
Box 40
525 W. 120th Street
New York, New York 10027
Telephone: (212) 678-3780

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Early Childhood Education*
College of Education
University of Illinois
805 W. Pennsylvania Avenue
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Telephone: (217) 333-1386

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Educational Management*
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
Telephone: (503) 686-5043

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Handicapped and Gifted Children*
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091
Telephone: (703) 620-3660

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Higher Education*
George Washington University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 296-2597

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Information Resources*
Syracuse University
School of Education
Syracuse, New York 13210
Telephone: (315) 423-3646

ERIC Clearinghouse for *Junior Colleges*
University of California
Powell Library, Rm. 96, 405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024
Telephone: (213) 825-3931

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Languages and Linguistics*
Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Telephone: (703) 528-4312

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Reading and Communication Skills*
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Road
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Telephone: (217) 328-3870

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Rural Education and Small Schools*
New Mexico State University
Box 3AP
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003
Telephone: (505) 646-2623

ERIC Clearinghouse for *Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education*
Ohio State University
1200 Chambers Road
Third Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43212
Telephone: (614) 422-6717

ERIC Clearinghouse for *Social Studies/ Social Science Education*
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302
Telephone: (303) 492-8434

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Teacher Education*
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 293-7280

ERIC Clearinghouse on *Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation*
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Telephone: (609) 921-9000 ext. 2182

Educational Resources Information Center
(Central ERIC)
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208
Telephone: (202) 254-5555

ERIC Processing & Reference Facility
4833 Rugby Avenue, Suite 303
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Telephone: (301) 656-9723

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P. O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210
Telephone: (703) 841-1212

Macmillan Information
866 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 935-3274

National Audiovisual Center

The National Audiovisual Center (NAC) was established in 1969 in the National Archives and Records Services, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. The Center provides reference and distribution services to anyone interested in audiovisual materials for instructional or promotional purposes--students, educators, government agencies, private organizations, and business and industry. The reference service helps the public become aware of the federal audiovisual materials (16 mm films, motion cartridge, audiodisc, audiotape, slide set and filmstrip) available for distribution through NAC, other federal agencies, and non-government services. The loan, rent and/or sale of audiovisual materials placed with NAC is the function of the distribution service.

A catalog of all the audiovisual materials available for sale and/or rent can be obtained from The Center. The format of the catalog includes a guide to subject section, title section, media format codes, title and agency numbers, series, new entries, and a supplement. Any requests for materials must contain a title, title number, agency number, date, complete shipping and billing address, telephone number, and remittance for all necessary prepaid charges. The user can contact the appropriate branch within NAC for sales, rental, or general information regarding these materials.

Many vocational and technical education related audiovisual materials are available from NAC.

National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Information Systems

The Clearinghouse is a relatively new information system. The grant to operate it has just been let by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Clearinghouse will provide free technical assistance to agencies planning or undertaking transfer of criminal justice information systems. In its continuing efforts to promote effective use of national criminal justice resources, SGI has developed an on-line, automated index of such systems nationwide, to be used as a prime clearinghouse tool. Further information is available from Search Group, Incorporated, National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Information Systems, 1620 35th Avenue, Sacramento, California 95822, Phone: (916) 392-2550.

National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture

The Clearinghouse, funded under contract to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration offers a broad variety of technical assistance services to criminal justice units of state and local government planners, architects, and others in an effort to improve the performance of the criminal justice system.

The Clearinghouse's staff of architects, former police and correction personnel, social scientists, planners, and lawyers has a main function of providing technical assistance to courts, police, and adult and juvenile corrections projects.

They also provide review of programs and plans services; development of guidelines for planning and designing police, court, and juvenile programs and facilities; and state master plans for criminal justice services development.

The Clearinghouse also conducts research activities via literature searches, compilation of topic-specific data, special projects, and related efforts.

NCCJPA publishes the Clearinghouse Transfer, a series of publications on individual programs and/or facilities in police, court, and corrections; the quarterly NCCJPA Report on Clearinghouse efforts; and Guidelines on various types.

An information resource center for Clearinghouse staff and visitors contains over 8,000 documents and 150 serials for on-site use. Constant acquisition of new reference materials provides an up-to-date information source for ongoing activities. The Clearinghouse address is: NCCJPA, Department of Architecture, University of Illinois, 505 East Green, Suite 200, Champaign, Illinois 61820, phone: (217) 333-0312.

National Criminal Justice Reference Service

NCJRS is an international reference and information service of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

NCJRS acquires, indexes, abstracts, stores, retrieves, and distributes reports and information related to all aspects of the criminal justice activities in America.

The Reference Service serves all levels of government including universities, professional associations, commercial and planning organizations, and the general public in addition to the primary audience of criminal justice professionals.

Services provided by NCJRS at no cost include: Selective Notification of Information--a monthly mailing; selected Bibliographies; Microfiche of documents not otherwise available through other information systems or sources; Document Loan Programs; Translations of foreign language documents, plus general reference and information services.

NCJRS is located in Washington, D.C. at the following address and phone: NCJRS, P. O. Box 24036, S.W. Post Office, Washington, D.C. 20024; (202) 755-9704.

National Information Center for Education Media

The National Information Center for Education Media (NICEM), University Park, Los Angeles, California, was established by the University of Southern California in 1966. The purpose of NICEM is to collect, catalog, and make available to the educational-library community, descriptive bibliographic information concerning all of the audiovisual materials distributed throughout the United States. NICEM basically receives the information from those who create or own the medium of interest (producers), from those who handle sale, lease, or rental of the particular production (distributors), and the Library of Congress.

Currently, seven non-book media (16 mm films, 35 mm filmstrips, 8 mm motion cartridges, over-head transparencies, educational records, audiotapes, and videotapes) are covered in the NICEM master data bank. Entries in the data bank are filed under 2,087 key words or subject headings oriented to (but not limited to) users at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels of education.

NICEM provides several publications and catalogs covering the seven non-book media mentioned above. One of the publications is the *Index to Vocational and Technical Education-Multimedia.* The Index is divided into three principal sections: (1) the "Subject Guide to Vocational and Technical Education-Multimedia;" (2) the "Alphabetical Guide to Vocational and Technical Education-Multimedia;" and (3) the "Directory of Producers and Distributors" including separate alphabetical listings by code and by name. More detailed procedures for using the index are available.

In addition to the services previously mentioned, NICEM also provides abstracting, indexing, custom cataloging and computer literature searching services. All NICEM data are stored on machine-readable tape, generated from punched cards. NICEM information and system are copyrighted by the University of Southern California.

National Technical Information Service

In 1970, the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia, was established as the primary operating unit within the U.S. Department of Commerce with the dual responsibility of (1) coordinating the business and technical information activities of the Department of Commerce, and (2) serving as the primary focal point within the federal government for accessing government publications and data files. More specifically, NTIS searches for, collects, catalogs, abstracts, indexes, announces, and disseminates unclassified or unlimited government-supported technical reports, translations, and data. Those who benefit from efforts by NTIS include students, researchers, business managers, and the like.

The subject areas covered in the NTIS document collection include science, technology, engineering, business, economics, and library and information science. The full range of subjects are characterized by the *COSATI Subject Category List*, and each document is cataloged according to the following COSATI standards: author, title, report number, contract number, accession/order number, date of repcrt, pagination, assigned descriptors, abstract, and price. The *Thesaurus of Scientific and Engineering Terms* (with subject, personal author, corporate author, contact number, and accession/report number categories) is used to index each document. Documents and magnetic tapes containing business, management, transportation, state and local information are also included in the collection.

NTIS services are available, without restrictions, to government, industry, and the general public. Documents/reports can be obtained in paper copy, microfilm for pre-1964 reports, microfiche, magnetic tapes, or punched cards. Microreproduction services include (1) selected categories in microfiche (SCIM), a bi-weekly dissemination service of microfiche subscriptions of reports in several hundred highly selective fields of interest; and (2) U.S. Patent on 16 mm microfilm.

NTIS also provides selected reference and referral services to its users. The Information Services Branch of NTIS serves as the reference center. It compiles general subject bibliographies and performs, for a fee, in-depth NTIS document searches via NTISearch, an on-line, interactive retrieval system. The bibliographic data base of NTIS is available on tape and contains current abstracts of research and analysis efforts sponsored by the government. In addition, other government agencies use NTIS facilities to announce and distribute their documents and data files.

Another service component of NTIS is the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS). It selects and translates research and development literature from all over the world. The JPRS Standing Order Service provides automatic mailing of translations as they become available. Translations are available in three categories: ad hoc scientific and technical, ad hoc social sciences, and serial reports.

NTIS makes a number of publciations available to interested readers, some of which are: *Weekly Government Abstracts, Government Reports Announcements,* and *Government Reports Index*. These periodicals are prepared from government-sponsored research and analysis information.

Smithsonian Science Information Exchange

The Smithsonian Science Information Exchange (SSIE), established in 1949, has assisted thousands of researchers in the physical and life sciences plan and perform their work by providing up-to-date information about research in progress.

The Exchange collects, indexes, stores, and disseminates data about basic and applied work in all areas of the physical and life sciences. Included in the life sciences are criminology; employment; sociology; medical sociology; social services; education and training; therapy; rehabilitation; and counseling.

SSIE's active file, which covers data collected during the past two government fiscal years, contains information on more than 200,000 current and recently completed research projects. New project information is added to the file daily. The current file contains data on 34,000 projects in the behavioral and social sciences.

SSIE acts as a complement to the other information systems described in this paper. SSIE helps by letting you know what's going on now.

The single-page Notice of Research Project (NRP) is the basic unit of information SSIE maintains. It contains the name of the supporting organization and the grant, contract, or agency control number assigned to the project; the performing organization name and address as well as the name and department or specialty of the principal and coinvestigators, the period of project activities and funding level; and, in most cases, a 200-word description of the work to be performed.

SSIE provides custom searches of its data base for $60 for the first fifty project notices and 25¢ for each additional project.

An SSIE Science Newsletter is available on a subscription basis for $10 per year. Also available for $180 per year are Selective Dissemination of Information services which provide twelve monthly updates of ongoing projects.

SSIE offers a unique service which can provide corrections educators with up-to-date information about ongoing projects. SSIE's address is Room 300, 1730 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; telephone: (202) 381-4211.

United States Naval Institute

The United States Naval Institute (NI) is located in Annapolis, Maryland. With the cooperation of the Naval Commands, the Institute identifies and reviews those courses developed by the U.S. Navy which may be useful to civilian institutions or agencies in training students in the basic technological skills. As a result, the efforts of NI have potential use by vocational and technical students, educators, business, industry or individuals having training responsibilities in technological skills.

To date, the Naval Institute has produced a packaged version of the Navy Basic Electricity and Electronics Individualized Learning System. This package is available to the civilian education community. A course summary, price sheet, and preview kits are available upon request.

In addition, through further study and investigation of Naval courses, NI has published a report entitled *An Inventory of U.S. Navy Courses Suitable for Use in Training Civilian Personnel in Basic Technical Skills.* This report contains those courses identified as useful in civilian training and are indexed by career fields. The format of the courses listed consists of the following headings: Career Field, Course, Catalog Number, Course Description, Comments, Course Content, Blocks, Note, Support Materials, and Equipment.

Anyone interested in acquiring this report or more detailed purchasing information should contact the Navy Institute. A complete file of Curriculum Outlines of the courses in the report can be made available for the minimal cost of copying, handling, and postage.

Research Coordinating Units

Research Coordinating Units (RCUs) are established throughout the Untied States and trust territories with locations in universities and state departments of education. The RCUs are mainly concerned with (1) research in vocational education, (2) research training programs, (3) projects designed to test the effectiveness of research findings, (4) demonstration and dissemination projects, (5) development of new vocational curricula, and (6) projects in the development of new careers and occupations. In other words, RCUs focus on research, development, technical assistance, and dissemination activities. Results of efforts by the RCUs are of potential benefit to vocational and technical educators, researchers, students, adminsitrators, and state department of education personnel at the secondary and post-secondary levels.

The Research Coordinating Units provide leadership for states' vocational education research and development programs; they also play a major role in long-range planning and development of vocational research priorities. In addition to their research and dissemination efforts among units, the RCUs occasionally provide to AIM/ARM information concerning ongoing projects or proposals. Also listed in the "Projects in Progress" section of AIM/ARM is a directory of state Research Coordinating Units, and titles of ongoing projects indexed by state.

Westinghouse Learning Corporation

With central facilities at 100 Park Avenue, New York, New York, the Westinghouse Learning Corporation (WLC) provides instructional materials in all media, for any given topic, and for audience levels ranging from pre-school through post-secondary institutions.

For those interested in instructional media, the Corporation provides a publication which lists all media in 47 different media classifications. This publication as well as its supplements comprises a catalog entitled *Learning Directory*. The "Directory" is designed to help the users obtain full information on all learning materials that meet their needs without having to restate or categorize the area of interest, thus eliminating cross-referencing. No judgment of educational quality or effectiveness is passed on entries in the *Learning Directory*; users are expected to form their own evaluation.

Information in the *Learning Directory* is divided into two sections: the "Instructional Materials Index" and the "Source Index." Each entry appears under one or more topic entries in the "Instructional Materials Index" and contains the following column headings: Topic, Level, Medium, Title, Color, Sound, Size, Price, Source, Reference, and Notes. The "Source Index" section provides names, addresses, and telephone numbers for each publisher, producer, or distributor whose offerings are included in the "Instructional Materials Index." A section called "Users Guide" (with information on the scope, special uses, and indexing rules and abbreviations of materials indexed in the catalog) assists the user in effectively using the *Learning Directory*.

Xerox University Microfilms, Curriculum Materials Clearinghouse

The Curriculum Materials Clearinghouse (CMC), a subsidiary of Xerox University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan, is an educational information and publishing service designed to acquire, compile, and disseminate instructional materials in all subject areas and at all grade levels. The CMC audience includes students, teachers, administrators, and anyone interested in commercial instructional materials.

The functions of the Clearinghouse are to (1) provide the education community with practical and innovative materials and ideas that would otherwise not receive wide dissemination, and (2) provide publishing services to curriculum developers who have not found suitable means for disseminating their materials or who have not been inclined to disseminate their materials. Materials announced through CMC are listed, indexed, abstracted, and critiqued for dissemination. A cooperative network of information and publishing services makes dissemination of these materials possible: *Curriculum Briefs and Index, Curriculum Materials Microfile,* Curriculum Publishing Service, and Curriculum Materials Copy Service.

Curriculum Briefs and Index is an information service which describes each instructional unit included in the *Curriculum Materials Microfile;* the Microfile contains microfiche copies of all materials submitted by curriculum developers and accepted by the Clearinghouse.

The Curriculum Publishing Service publishes new instructional materials in all content areas produced by developers. The Curriculum Materials Copy Service provides xerographic, lithographic, and microfiche copies of CMC printed materials on a demand basis. In addition, the copy service, upon request, obtains copyright registration for eligible materials produced by its contributors.

Needless to say, we have covered quite a few information systems which are potentially of benefit to you.

I encourage you to keep these sources of information in mind as you undertake new activities of vocational education for offenders. Use the systems to find out what others have done, whether they've succeeded or failed, and what they recommend be done in the future.

Don't forget that this searching takes time, seemingly endless amounts of time. But that time spent learning what has or has not been done by others usually turns out to pay great dividends in the long run. Time spent planning your endeavors with the help of information provided by the various systems described is certainly worth the effort.

Who needs information retrieval systems? You do! I do! We all need them and all should use them. They're there to serve you; to make your work easier and more effective.

THE FUTURE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR CORRECTIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by Kenneth A. Polcyn*

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore the technologies that will be available in the 1980's that could support correctional community education and training programs. Discussed at the outset are some education-training related problems facing the community, followed by an overview of selected evolving technologies that may aid in overcoming some of the community's problems. This is followed by a discussion of possible uses in the correctional community. Finally, some of the requirements that are necessary to take advantage of these technologies are presented.

Some Institutional Problems

The correctional community is confronted with an increasing population, and limited resources for their accommodation. Between January 1976 and January 1977, the inmate population increased by 13 percent. Overcrowding is commonplace, but resources to attend to the supportive needs are barely keeping pace. Eighty percent of the expenditures are for security and administration, and 97 percent of the support personnel are assigned to custodial activities. Consequently, while the inmate population is increasing, the resources available for rehabilitative programs are decreasing. But, the problems are compounded by staffing inadequacies, limited academic and vocational curricula, poor physical facilities, absolete equipment, and limited job placement programs. Further, as the population increases and time evolves there is also an effect created by a more educated U.S. population from which inmates come. Furthermore, today we live in a technological society which is in a constant state of flux where professions and vocations are constantly emerging and the commonly known become obsolete over night. Consequently, there is a requirement for the rehabilitative programs to adjust accordingly. But, how, when the current needs of inmates and staff are not being met?

It is not possible if institutional and state programs wish to remain autonomous; there appears to be no way to develop programs to meet the diverse capabilities and needs of the staff and inmate population if the autonomy concept remains. Relatively speaking, the population of state institutions is very small compared to public school districts, and even in the public schools there continues to be problems in obtaining resources to establish and/or continue programs to match the diverse student capability and needs. Public schools have attempted to address their problems by exploring the potential of technology, as have some members of the correctional community. One example of this is the Illinois Correctional System adaptation of the PLATO IV Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) program for correctional education. However, a broader perspective of the applciation of technology is needed in the correctional community if it is to have an opportunity to stem the tide against what appears to be overwhelming odds. A potential key concept to rival the odds is the possibility of states pooling and sharing scarce resources. How would this be possible? By taking advantage of existing and emerging technologies that could permit, where applicable, bringing the concept to fruition. The technologies referred to require no new inventions! Rather, what is required is an inventive and systematic approach to thinking about how they can be used.

---

*Kenneth A. Polcyn is Research Director, Communications Satellite Applications Program Manager, Education and Training Systems, PRC Information Sciences Company, McLean, Virginia.

Evolving Technologies

When referring to evolving technologies, what is meant are those technologies that may be in use now but their true potential remains to be tapped. By the 1980's there is a chance that their vast potential will be realized. Briefly discussed are some of those technologies to include computer, audio, microvideo and distribution technologies.

Computers

Computer technology has been with us since the 1940's and considerable resources have been expended to use it as an instructional tool. The most noted tools have been Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) and Computer Managed Instruction (CMI).

CAI, as you know, emphasizes content within the computer with which the student interacts. This application can be as pedestrian as basic drill and practice exercises, or as sophisticated as tutorial programs where the computer acts as the instructor. The costs of CAI systems has been a factor in their slow evolution. The millions that must be invested in the computer, peripherals, and software requires considerable student contact hours to justify its value. Developing sufficient quality and diverse courseware, plus reaching a large student population has been a major problem.

CMI is a management system where the computer contains no learning materials, but directs the learning activities of students. Its sophistication also varies from simple test scoring to predicting a student's time to complete materials based on abilities. The system is a tool for instructional personnel so they can manage and work with a student population studying many different subjects. Generally speaking, at the outset students are tested for ability and the results are entered into the computer data base. The student signs on for a course, and the computer selects the course track based on ability and predicts the time to complete, providing the information to the student and the instructor. The student's printout tells the student what self-paced multimedia materials to use and indicates their location in the learning library. The student studies the materials and works with the instructor as required. The student is tested when requested using mark sensed answer sheets which are entered into the computer through an OpScan machine. Test results are provided in twelve seconds noting remedial work if required. While a number of the CMI systems exist, probably the most successful has been in the military environment where a large student population is being reached. But like CAI, they are expensive to develop requiring both computer software and self-paced courseware.

An emerging training tool associated with the computer is simulation. Rather than using the computer as a programmed text or a learning management system, it is being used to present operational problems in the context of the "real world." For example, an engineering student may be given the task of designing a bridge. With the given environmental conditions, geological data, load requirements, etc., the student then specifies in detail the bridge design; based on this information, the computer configures the bridge on a cathode-ray tube and subjects it to various traffic loads and environmental stresses. The results are displayed as the computer critiques the design pointing out the weak and strong points of the design. Such uses are being made of the computer for environmental impact studies associated with housing developments, shopping centers, and airports; also, they are being used for such things as automobile designs, the development of medicines, and determining the approaches for resolving the water pollution problem. The use of the computer in this way makes learning relevant because individuals can observe the results of their work and be counseled accordingly. Like CAI and CMI, the application is costly, but it has great potential for training because it approximates reality.

Besides the instructional mode, computers have been used increasingly as a career counseling medium. The Computerized Vocational Information System (CVIS) and the System of Interactive Guidance and Information (SIGI) are examples of operational systems. CVIS was developed under the sponsorship of the State of Illinois Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, Division of Vocational and Technical Education and SIGI was developed by Educational Testing Service under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation and the National Science Foundation. CVIS is geared to junior high, senior high, and community college students, and at each instructional level orients them to available careers relative to their type and quality of school work, extracurricular activities, test scores, and their selection and responses to computerized scripts and related questions. SIGI was designed for the career counseling of community college students. The system aids the students in deciding on ultimate career goals and in planning a resultant course of study. Basically, such systems are still in their infancy, but do hold great promise. But, like the other uses of computers noted above, they are quite expensive to develop.

A very exciting use of computers that has emerged recently is the use of a computer to read texts. This was developed by Kurzweil Computer Products, Incorporated, with grants from the National Federation of the Blind. A printed page is palced on a glass topped scannning device and the computer reads the page at a rate of 200 words a minute. The machine can be used to reread a line or selected words. While the purpose of the machine is to aid the blind, it can also serve education and training in other ways. For example, it could be used to help individuals with reading problems by reading texts along with the student and helping with the pronunciation of difficult words. With just a little thinking, there are many additional applications. The system is expected to be available by 1981 costing in the neighborhood of $5,000 to $10,000.

Another computer endeavor which has tremendous implications for the future is the Department of Defense's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) effort which permits various types of computers in different geographical locations to talk with each other with great flexibility and speed. Key components of the system are interface message processors (IMPS) and terminal interface processors (TIPS). IMPS permits the accptance message, breaks them into thousand-bit packages and sends each packet to its destination by whatever terrestrial route is open at the time. IMPS also processes the message so that they can be received by the computer to which it is addressed. TIPS is an array of equipment that allows a user to become a part of the network without owning a major computer system. The great potential of the system is obvious. It can permit computer sharing arrangements so that data bases and programs can be shared as well as permit access to more powerful and flexible computers than a user might possess. In essence, the ARPA system could be the genesis for the integration of education-training related computer systems.

Audio

With increasing emphasis on computer and video systems, there is a tendency to forget the types of media a basic FM audio circuit can provide. The subcarrier multiple channel technique known as Subsidiary Communications Authorization (SCA) has considerable potential. Perhaps the most significant factor about SCA channels is that an audio or visual signal can be transmitted. The only constraint is that the information signal does not exceed a bandwidth of approximately

50 Hertz* (Hz) to 15 Kilohertz (KHz), a bandwidth range required for high-quality speech and music channels. Using this approach, slides, filmstrips, overhead transparencies, and so on, can be transmitted at the rate of one each minute over an FM radio SCA channel with a resolution comparable to that of television. If higher resolution is required, the transmission rate could be reduced, for example, to one picture each two minutes to achieve a line resolution twice that of television.

The terminal equipment required to achieve this bandwidth-picture rate trade-off consists of either a scan converter, if television type displays are desired, or ordinary facsimile transmitters and receivers, if hardcopy displays are required. The complete audiovisual presentation can be transmitted over an FM station equipped with SCA equipment by carrying the audio portion on the main program channel and the visual portion on one of the SCA sub-channels. Actually, a single FM station equipped with three SCA sub-channels is capable of broadcasting two separate audiovisual instructional programs simultaneously. The use of four SCA sub-channels could release the main program channel for conventional public broadcasting use and still permit the transmission of two audiovisual instructional programs to all homes, schools, and other institutions within range of the FM station. The following list and brief description constitutes a partial inventory of the techniques available for the transmission of still (or slow-scan) visuals on FM sub-channels and other instructional applications of FM Multiplexing.

Facsimile Transmissions

Facsimile transmissions offer a means of distributing hardcopy visual materials from a central source. Facsimile equipment permits the transmission (or broadcasting) or photographs or illustrations characterized by multiple shades of gray, as well as line drawings. Most facsimile devices are designed to operate over a transmission channel intended for speech applications such as telephone lines or radio channels encompassing a bandwidth of as little as 3 KHz. For such applications, a single facsimile transmitter is required at the origination point, a device which can be connected to to the input of the FM SCA channel almost as simply as an ordinary microphone.

Teleprinters

Each teleprinter channel requires a frequency range of only a few hundred cycles per second. Consequently, one SCA channel with the appropriate interface equipment could handle up to twelve or fifteen separate circuits on one SCA channel. Teleprinter systems are generally conceded to be the most efficient method of electronically transmitting hardcopy information from one point to another or to multiple points. Of course, such systems are limited to the transmission and remote reproduction of printed text.

Electrowriters

Electrowriters are devices which permit remote reproduction of handwritten materials such as sketches, mathematical formulae or anything which can be written on a classroom blackboard. The marriage of the overhead projector with an electrowriter receiver to permit group viewing on a standard projection screen constitutes a form of the "remote multiple electronic blackboard" or whiteboard.

---

*A Hertz is a unit of electronic wave or cycle per second. Kilohertz is one thousand cycles per second.

Blackboard-by-Wire

Blackboard-by-wire is a form of "electrowriter" device which provides a reproduction of sketches directly on the screen of a standard television receiver. The blackboard-by-wire system is essentially a pair of slow scan devices which are interconnected by a voice-grade transmission circuit, even though the quasi-stationary display takes place on the screen of a standard TV receiver.

Slow-Scan Television

Slow-scan television differs from electrowriters and blackboard-by-wire in that either a standard TV camera coupled with a scan converter or a special slow-scan TV camera is used as the pickup device. As a result, live scenes or any other subject matter that can be televised by a standard TV camera can be transmitted over a voice-grade transmission circuit and reproduced on a standard TV receiver. Terminal hardware capable of exploiting sampling techniques to permit multi-channel slow screen transmission over a single narrow-band (voice grade) transmission circuit is now available.

The point should be evident; we tend to overlook the potential of an audio channel for transmitting video related media. But it can be done, all within the cost of an audio bandwidth.

Microvideo

The Videodisc made its debut in 1970 but it was only recently that announcements were made that such a system will be on sale in late 1977 or early 1978. Videodisc technology has exciting potential for the education community because it will permit vast amounts of information to be stored on a single, thin plastic disc the size of a 78 RPM record. For example, the MCA-Phillips Video-disc has 54,000 tracks which represent 54,000 images, whether pages or film frames, which can be stored on a single videodisc. In other words, the thirty volumes of the Encyclopedia Brittanica could be stored on a six discs. The cost of a videodisc system seems quite modest. It is estimated that the disc itself will run in the neighborhood of $10 and the player about $500. One of the potentials is for establishing central or regional multimedia centers which could be accessed through telecommunications technology. Vast amounts of material could be stored at a few facilities rather than everyone attempting to have their own centers. Individual instructional media centers are costly. The inventory of materials that must be kept, the initial cost, the replacement cost, the required storage space, the maintenance requirements of the materials, and the frequently short lifetime of materials make large media centers impractical and uneconomical or individual institutions.

Another microvideo technology which is in its infancy is known as pseudo-interactive television. In essence, it permits the viewer to interact with a TV program as if it were a two-way system. The concept is quite simple. When a TV program is being developed, such as Seame Street, an accompanying interactive track is developed and cued to the program. At the outset of the program airing, the interactive track is transmitted to a minicomputer within the TV set. Then, as the Sesame Street program is transmitted, the information in the minicomputer appears on the screen as it is automatically called up by the live program. For example, scrambled letters might appear, and using a keyboard attached to the TV set, the viewer may be asked to spell a word from them. After a brief period, the properly spelled words would appear on the screen for the viewer to compare.

Distribution Technologies

Two distribution technologies have emerged recently. Cable systems which came into existence in the 1950's and communication satellites which made their debut as a commercial venture in the 1960's.

Most people are familiar with cable technology because it provides for a great amount of our TV in the U.S. Basically, the system consists of a head end, which is a large tower that receives signals from either a microwave repeater network or over-the-air signals from distant broadcast stations. The signals are amplified and fed into communities through a main coaxial cable called a trunk. Feeder cables from the trunk provide the direct distribution to a dwelling. Originally, cable systems were one-way or what is commonly known as a receive-only system. However, a major change recently occurred. The FCC requires new cable TV systems in major metropolitan areas to be two-way systems so that it is possible for a subscriber to communicate in a low bit digital rate with the head end, or studio. Thus, this new dimension has great potential for providing access to computer-based learning systems and/or learning systems at facilities located in the local network pattern.

A major breakthrough in communications has been satellite technology. In 1965 it moved the world into the Communications Era. Satellites now permit access to the most remote reaches of the earth. The satellite is a relay system capable of handling any signal that can be transmitted terrestrially via microwaves, local cable systems, or broadcast stations. In fact, in many ways the satellite is similar to a local broadcast station, but capable of larger geographic coverage from its relative stationary position 22,300 miles above the equator of the earth. From this position, signals can be showered down over one third of the surface of the earth. And, theoretically, anyone in the signal footprint who has the proper receiving system can access the relayed information. Three satellites located over the equator can cover 90 percent of the surface of the earth. The polar regions are not covered. The power of the satellite affects the earth station or receiving systems. The more powerful and stable the satellite, and the more concentrated the focus of its signal on the earth, the less sophisticated and expensive the receiving system. Some potential applications of the technology become readily apparent when consideration is given to the coverage area of a single satellite and the geographical distance from which signals can be received without the complex terrestrial networking support. One point to take into account is that satellite system costs are not governed by all factors associated with terrestrial system costs, thus, satellite systems have the potential to provide less expensive communication services. Another point is that the technology can permit aggregation of numbers of widely dispersed individuals to simultaneously share services, personnel, equipment, materials, or other scare resources. In this same vein, the technology also can permit individual or personalized service, perhaps more cheaply, by letting a larger number of dispersed individuals with unique needs come together as an aggregate to use services.

The Technologies as a System

If the technologies are viewed as separate entities, their potentials will appear somewhat limited. But, if viewed as possible components of a potential system to serve the correctional community, their potential becomes considerably greater.

A key to the system concept are the distribution technologies, particularly the communications satellite, because of its ability to permit direct access to any point on the surface of the earth. Consequently, existing terrestrial communication systems like microwave and cable systems can be tied together to provide service between and among institutions, or the satellite can provide for direct communications. Keeping this in mind, the value of the other technologies become readily apparent.

Looking at the computer technologies, the potential value of CAI, CMI, simulation and the Reader for the corrections community are substantial. All four can be used to address the individual needs of staff and inmate population. However, they are too costly to develop on an individual state or correctional institution basis. Further, existing programs are difficult to access because of the differences in computers, associated languages and cost. However, the ARPA system technology could permit correctional institutions to access any computer no matter what the language and share in the use of these learning systems at considerable cost savings. In addition, computer based counseling and learning systems could be developed on a shared cost basis to address the unique and diverse needs of the community, and accessed via satellite or in combination with other telecommunications means. Consequently, the cost of development to each individual state or institution would be small, and the overall user population potential high, thus possibly translating to a lower cost per student contact hour.

The microvideo, particularly the videodisc, technology would appear to have the potential for playing a major role in such a system. Easy to access, centralized media centers could be established. Here, also, materials could be developed on a shared cost basis and maintained at such centers. Materials to be used for instruction could be selected from a list of available media, and through the use of computer and distribution technologies, accessed and distributed to the requesting institution in a matter of minutes in whatever form desired. Because the master always would be maintained at the center, the materials can be discarded when they are no longer needed. The cost savings in storage space, materials purchase and maintenance could be considerable; however, the types and quantity of materials available could be greatly increased.

Audio circuit usage is directly related to the media center concept, since most media that possibly would be transmitted would use audio circuits and this is extremely important because of the cost factor. However, another aspect of the audio component is that institutions could use such circuits to exchange paperwork, hold conferences or conduct joint classes. If motion video is not required, such an approach can provide for low cost administrative and instructional activities among and between institutions. For example, conducting multi-institutional staff conferences or institutes could be commonplace. Audio exchanges, visual displays, and document transfers could occur and business transacted with no reduction in efficiency or effectiveness, but with a reduction in cost.

This brief discussion of the potentials of the evolving technologies should give you some idea how these technological tools might serve the correctional community. They could help to build a system that could permit institutions to pool and share resources, and possibly provide the services that cannot be provided now within the constraints of current practices. They should not be viewed as a threat to your domain as an educator or as a human being. The technologies are tools that can supplement and support you. But the technologies must be planned for and integrated into the educational and training systems so they can do what they do best, and let you do what you do best as the human component of the system.

Some Requirements for Taking Advantage of the Technologies

To put the technologies to use in the correctional community would first require a complete understanding of their capabilities, what they can accomplish relative to services and their associated costs. In placing the technologies in their proper perspective, the correctional community would need to assess service requirements and associated media, then explore the potential of the technologies in meeting these requirements by comparing the quality and cost of alternative service delivery systems.

Next, it is imperative that the correctional user staff become knowledgeable about the services that can be provided, learn how to take advantage of the media, and plan for integrating the media into the operational scheme of things. As noted previously, individuals must understand the place of technology and the place of the human element and be comfortable with these roles. This would be one of the most difficult requirements to meet since, for example, educators are used to competing with media for the dissemination of information.

What the latter situation indicates is a need to train the staff for their new roles and associated functions. Too often, we assume that such training will somehow occur through on-the-job training. Unfortunately, such an assumption is the "kiss of death" for any new program. While there is a requirement for such training, you would be hard pressed to find a related program at any teacher training institution. Consequently, these training programs usually must be developed internally, with the aid of educational technologists who understand the problems, the technology and its relationship to instruction.

Given there is an understanding of the technology and personnel are trained, to put a technology based system together would require a well-defined and highly specialized organizational-management structure. Serving the correctional institutions of the several states with a technology based support system would be a new concept requiring unprecedented cooperation and coordination. Such an entity would be required to establish policies and procedures that would meet the unique needs of each state, but also the common needs of all states. Further, with guidance from the states, the body would need to have the authority to make decisions about how dollars should be allocated for optimum program payoff. In effect, the organizational-management structure would need to have authority in matters as diverse as telecommunications policy and courseware development.

Of course, a key requirement is that a large population be served. Consequently, to achieve the economics of scale needed for a technology based system means that as many correctional institutions as possible would need to be involved. While we may tend to think in terms of the state or federal institutions, the municipal and local jails with their large inmate population also have a need for such a program, and have even less money to pay for services. Therefore, this requirement should be kept foremost in your mind because this is the key to improved services at reduced cost. This type of system is possible only if developmental and usage costs can be shared by many.

In light of the cost discussion, it is appropriate that this paper be concluded with the somber note that someone must pay for such a system. If a technology based support system for correctional institution services is to come to fruition, there must be money to pay the initial start-up cost, and then continue to pay for its operation, administration and maintenance. There is no doubt that the initial costs would be substantial; but, if shared by the correctional community, the impact on each state probably would be small. What would be the cost of such a system? This is difficult to say. It would depend on many factors to include the number of people to be served, the sophistication of the communications required, the spectrum of services offered, the courseware to be developed and so on. In order to get specific about costs, we would need to specify an operational system. Nevertheless, to establish and use such a system would require the financial commitment of the several states.

Conclusions

The rising inmate population and increasing cost of institutional operations and maintenance leave few dollars for correctional or rehabilitative programs. As a result, it is becoming increasingly difficult to provide meaningful programs. As the discussion points out, one possible way to overcome this problem is to use technology as a means to pool your limited resources, develop programs of merit, and share them through the use of technology.

However, the future of technology for education in the correctional community depends on you the planner and user. If you think in terms of a single institution or institutions within a single state, the technologies that you can afford to use are limited and thus the future for technology is limited. But, if your interests take on a national perspective where the institutions and states work toward solving common problems and eliminating duplications of effort, the future for technology is bright. This is not to say technology will solve all of your problems; in fact, in same instances it will create problems. Nevertheless, the positive factors can outweigh the negative if the use of technology is properly approached.

Consequently, it behooves you to work as a unit to identify common needs in correctional vocational education; to assess the technologies that may be of value for meeting these needs; to establish state, regional, and national mechanisms as required to permit the sharing of the technologies; and mold the useful technologies into a comprehensive system that all members of the correctional community can share. This is a goal worth working towards.

Bibliography

ARPANET Information Brochure, Washington, D.C.: Defense Communications Agency, DOD, August 1976.

Egan, Jack, "Videodiscs' Debut: Can $10 Movies Sell?" in *The Washington Post*, Sunday, February 20, 1977.

Hollowell, Mary Louis, Editor, *Cable Handbook 1975-1976.* Washington, D.C.: Publi-Cable, Inc., 1975.

Klaus, David J., *Instructional Innovation and Individualization.* Pittsburg: American Institute for Research, 1969.

Koh, Sherwood G., *The New Technologies: Are They Worth It?* Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, March 1973.

Mitzel, Harold E., Editor, *An Examination of the Short-Range Potential of Computer-Managed Instruction.* Conference Proceedings, National Institute of Education Grant No. NIE-C-74-0091, November 6-8, 1974.

The National Federation of the Blind, *Kurzweil Reading Machine.* Washington, D.C.: 1975.

Parker, Lorne A., Editor, *The Status of the Telephone in Education.* Report of the Second Annual International Communications Conference, Division of Educational Communication, University of Wisconsin, Extension, Madison, 1976.

Pennsylvania State University, *Cable Television: A Message About the Medium,* Continuing Education Services, no date.

Polcyn, Kenneth A. et al., *Broadcast Satellites and Other Educational Technologies for Developing Countries: Possible Key Policy Decision Points 1972-1976.* Washington, D.C.: Educational Technology Enterprises, December 1976.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., "Broadcast Satellites for Formal Education: The Preparatory Stages." An invited paper presented at the International Telemetering Conference, Silver Spring, Maryland, October 15, 1975.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., "Communication Satellite Technology as a Potential Comprehensive Delivery System for Correctional Institution Education and Training Programs." An invited paper presented at the 21st Annual Southern Conference on Corrections, Tallahassee, Florida, February 26, 1976.

Polcyn, Kenneth A. et al., *Computer Managed Instruction by Satellite: Phase I, A Feasibility Study.* Orlando: Training Analysis and Evaluation Group, TAEG Report No. 44, December 1976.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., Editor-Contributor, *The Education-Training Uses of Broadcast Satellites: Status, Applications, Costs and Issues.* A book scheduled for publication in 1977 by Educational Technology Publications, Incorporated.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., *An Educator's Guide to Communications Satellite Technology.* 2nd Edition, Washington, D.C.: Andromeda Books, The Publishing Division of MATS, Inc., April 1975.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., *An Evaluation of the Use of Communication Satellites for Providing a Computer Managed Instruction (CMI) System at Remote Sites.* Planning Research Corporation, Information Sciences Company, M19752, January 1976.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., "Instructional Delivery Systems in Business and Industry: The Use of Communications Satellites as a Comprehensive Delivery System." An invited paper presented at the Society for Applied Learning Technology Conference, Washington, D.C., July 22, 1976.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., "Some Potential Learning Community Competitors for the Use of the Allocated Broadcast Frequency Spectrum." An invited paper presented at the Satellite/Cable Conference, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, June 3, 1975.

Polcyn, Kenneth A., "The U.S. Navy Computer Managed Instruction Demonstration" in *Educational Technology,* Vol. 16, No. 12, December 1976, pp. 21-25.

Rossi, Peter H. and Biddle, Bruce J., Editors, *The New Media and Education: Their Impact on Society.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.

Schramm, Wilbur, *Big Media, Little Media.* Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, March 1973.

SECTION FIVE:

PLANNING, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND STANDARDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

- Research Approaches to Planning and Accountability for Vocational Education in Corrections
- The Development of Standards for Corrections

RESEARCH APPROACHES TO PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS: THE SYSTEMS APPROACH

by Ronald J. Waldron*

Today, more than ever correctional administrators are concerned over the costs and effectiveness of correctional programs. Budget dollars are increasingly harder to come by. Many states and local governments simply do not have the money. Recent assessments of the effectiveness of correctional programs have cast considerable doubt on the treatment ideal. All of these things have led to a greater demand for the accountability of correctional programs. Accountability, that in many cases can only be provided through increased research and evaluation of correctional programs.

The need for research in criminal justice has long been recognized. As early as 1931 The National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement indicated a need for more valid and reliable information on the criminal justice system. Later in 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended expanded research in criminal justice. Again in 1973 the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals called for more research. Only late last year the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals issued forth a complete volume on criminal justice research and development. Again, the importance of research and evaluation in criminal justice was emphasized.

Recommending more and better research is one thing, however, conducting better research is another. There are as many research approaches as there are researchers. Research is to some extent an art as well as a science. As such it is neither practical nor possible to recommend one approach over another. Each must be weighted in the context of the study to be conducted.

There is, however, one approach that I often find useful—the systems approach.

The systems approach comes with good credentials. Its use in such diverse fields as national defense, medicine, and business management has enabled researchers in these areas to make quantum leaps in their knowledge. In fact, the use of systems analysis in criminal justice was recommended in 1967 by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Systems type studies are also recommended in the 1976 report on research and development in criminal justice prepared by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

While at first blush the systems approach may appear to be complicated and incomprehensible, its basic principles are not hard to grasp.

Let us consider for a moment some of the basic principles of systems analysis.

---

*Ronald J. Waldron is Correctional Program Specialist, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C.

What is a system? A system has been defined as a number of activities united by some regular interaction or interdependence. For example, we have social systems, the criminal justice system, correctional systems, educational systems, and a vocational program can be viewed as a system. Each will have some form of activities that interact and have some interdependence.

Common to all systems are certain basic characteristics that should be recognized. They include inputs, system process, outputs, control points, and feedback. Some explanation of these characteristics are necessary before we proceed.

Inputs are those things that move into a system. In a correctional vocational program this would include inmates, staff, material, and money. A systems approach would require that full consideration be given to the quantity and quality of all inputs into a vocational program. Are staff adequately qualified? Do inmates possess the requisite aptitudes to complete the program? Do we possess the necessary machinery and equipment to conduct a relevant and meaningful vocational program? All of these things should be considered fully.

Next we have the system process. The system process refers to the interactions that take place during the conduct of the vocational program. Can staff communicate course material to the inmates? Are the inmates getting "hands on experience?" Consideration must be given to all that takes place within the system.

Outputs of the system are also important. Outputs are those things that move out of a system. In a correctional vocational program, trained inmates would be the primary output. Cost per inmate and number of completions would be others. Just as we observe and measure the quantity of inputs so also should we observe and measure the quality and quantity of outputs.

Overseeing the inputs, system process, and outputs are the control points. The control points are those basic steps which are put in a system to make sure all aspects of the system are functioning properly. The instructor of a vocational program would be one control point, the warden would be another.

Last we have feedback. Feedback is measured information that is fed back to control points. For example, feedback could include recidivism rates, employment rates or income levels of recent vocational program graduates. Feedback is necessary to determine if the system is functioning as it was designed to function.

Summarizing these basic system characteristics, we have: (1) inputs: things that move into a system; (2) system process: interaction within a system; (3) outputs: things that move out of a system; (4) control points: things that direct the operation of a system; and (5) feedback: information fed back to the system.

With these basic concepts in mind we now have a basic framework within which we can now plan a vocational program and from which we can also develop measures of accountability.

The first task of a systems approach is a clear statement of the goals and objectives of the program. For example the goal of a vocational program could be to train an inmate to be a competent air conditioner repairman, or the goal may be to see that an inmate so trained becomes gainfully employed in his trained skill on release from prison. The first goal suggests that emphasis be placed on training the inmate to be a competent air conditioner repairman. As such our inputs and system process would focus on accomplishment of this objective. If on the other hand our goal is to see that an inmate is gainfully employed as trained then perhaps job counseling should be included in the program. Inputs and system process must be related to the goals and objectives of the program.

Both of the aforementioned goals are outputs of the vocational program system. One could be measured at the end of the program while the other would require some follow-up. How the goals and objectives are stated will determine at what point the outputs are measured.

In stating goals and objectives we must state them in measurable terms. If the performance of a system cannot be measured than a systems usefulness cannot be tested. For example, if a given programs goal is to train an inmate in a given skill and completion is stated in terms of a passing score on a standard test, then we have clear and measurable goals. However, if the goal of a program is to raise employment potential, we have a much more difficult goal to measure, if we can measure it at all.

With clear goals and objectives stated the systems analysis would then consider the various alternative methods for attaining the goals and objectives. Is it cheaper and possible to send an inmate to a private barber college? Will an inmate be better qualified if he finishes the prison's welding or some private program? Will contract teachers cost less and do a better job than full-time employees? The systems analysis strives to attain maximum benefits at minimum costs.

Once a specific method for reaching the stated goals and objectives is determined, the program system must be examined in the context of the larger system it will operate in. Will the vocational education subsystem contribute to the greater goals of the correctional system? Can the vocational education subsystem operate without conflict in the correctional system? The vocational subsystem must work in concert with the correctional system. Conflicts should be resolved at the outset. Prior to the initiation of a project, the input, system process, and output measures need to be identified and procedures established for gathering the measures. Standards and criteria for measures should be specified. For example, for a vocational program inputs could be enrollments, dollars, and staff. System process measures could be teacher contact hours, student participation hours, class size, and teaching methodology. Outputs could be number of completions, number of dropouts, and cost per completion. These measures should be related to certain standards. For example, expected teacher contact hours, costs per completion, hours per completion, and other measures should have standards of performance for given programs. Standards of performance will give the control points something to aim at, and it would insure some minimal level of performance.

Given a vocational program with a system of measures on inputs, system process, outputs we can then evaluate the system. For example, if the costs per completion are high we can feed this information (feedback) back to the teacher (control points). The teacher can then adjust the system to reduce costs per completion. He or she may do this by increasing class size or reducing staff size or cutting back in operational expenses. If inmates fail to pass standard tests, then this information can be used to change the teaching content of the program. By linking together input, system process, and output measures we can develop indices of performance and costs. These indices can be used to justify program changes, program increases, or program cancellations. The correctional administrator can use these indices to determine the cost effectiveness of various programs and put his limited dollars where they will buy the most results.

This brief exercise in "Systems Thinking" illustrates some of the utility of a systems approach to correctional vocational education programs. It is not offered as a total solution, but as a logical framework from which you can examine more thoroughly your programs.

STATUS OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT BY THE COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION FOR CORRECTIONS

by Jack Heard*

It is doubtful that anyone here has to be convinced of the need for standards in the field of corrections. Without question, the implementation of standards and the accreditation process will be beneficial to everyone, from the offender to the public, and to the development of the field of Corrections as a profession.

The development of professional codes and standards has been much longer in coming to the field of corrections, than to many other professional fields of endeavor, such as medicine or education. Now, however, we, too, have standards by which we can measure our progress and evaluate the performance of our duties as correctional professionals.

Furthermore, with the advent of these standards which have been developed by corrections professionals themselves, our goals and directions will be decided by those in the field, instead of those outside it.

Today, the correctional field is under closer scrutiny and more criticism than ever before. Much of the criticism has come from various organizations and agencies, including courts and legislators. Those who are most critical are the most anxious to propose standards for us to follow.

At one extreme, are the critics who would have us close the institutions and place all the offenders in community based correctional facilities. At the other extreme are those who would have us lock up all offenders and throw away the key. Without the guidance provided through our standards, we would be at the mercy of "outsiders" in the handling of our correctional problems.

Standards are not to be considered as a panacea, for there is none. Standards are however, a frame of reference by which to measure our past, present and future staff, facilities and operational methods.

The Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, in stating the goals of the correctional field, clearly mandates the need for standards to promote accountability, quality in, and coordination of all phases of services to the public and the offender alike. The goals of the correctional field as written in the "Statement of Principles" include: (1) the protection of the public as the highest priority; (2) assistance to the court in disposition of offenders; (3) help promote law abiding behavior among offenders; (4) provide just and humane care in the management of offenders; (5) promote research in the causes of crime and effective methods of corrections; (6) promote efficiency and economy in correctional operations; (7) promote and participate in programs, activities and services of correctional agencies; and (8) to motivate and improve employee performance through education and training.

---

*Jack Heard is Sheriff, Harris County (Houston), Texas.

The implications of these goals and standards place the responsibility for their fulfillment on the shoulders of all levels of correctional personnel in all phases of correctional services. The fact that educational programs fulfill an important role in the just and humane management of prisoners is documented by the Commission. The Proposed Standards for Long-Term Adult Institutions contains the following statement: "The institution administers programs available to all inmates that include, but are not limited to . . . Academic education equivalent to high school; and vocational training."

The discussion begins with the comment:

> To avoid dehumanizing effects of imprisonment and to offer the offender a wide range of constructive and self-improvement activities, the institution should provide adequate budget and staff for the above listed programs and activities.

Briefly, the history of this movement toward the implementation of standards and the accreditation process is as follows: For the past several years, the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, under sponsorship of the American Correctional Association, has addressed itself to the problem of implementation of standards for corrections. The struggle to establish correctional standards is not new. It predates the Commission by more than a century. The first recorded implementation of standards dates back to the late 18th century when the Philadelphia Prison Society urged the segregation of offenders by sex and severity of offense.

The American Prison Association, now the American Correctional Association, first published in 1870 a manual entitled *A Declaration of Principles* which has been revised and republished five times. The 1954 version, entitled *A Manual of Correctional Standards* actually was the first book to contain a plan for the testing and implementation of standards. The current issue, published in 1966, notes that "A decade has passed, without such testing and, in fact, two decades since the original proposal. . . ."

Similarly, the National Probation and Parole Association produced a model of conditions for the operation of probation and parole. The agency became the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and the 1955 revision of the early model became the Standard Probation and Parole Act.

In 1966, the Standard Act for State Correctional Services was published jointly by the ACA and the NCCD. A comprehensive document, the Standard Act for State Correctional Services, set guidelines at the organizational and administrative levels, for all types of correctional service agencies.

Other sets of standards and goals have been published by such auspicious groups as the American Bar Association and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, but these have remained published idealisms, not practical procedures to be applied to operating agencies.

The cornerstone of the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections was a 1968 study conducted by the ACA and funded by the Ford Foundation. Entitled the Self-Evaluation and Accreditation Project, this study concluded that the formal yet voluntary application of standards was valuable.

Based on the findings of the Self-Evaluation and Accreditation Project, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration awarded a grant to the American Correctional Association to establish the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. The Commission consists of twenty members who represent all aspects of corrections and the criminal justice system, the business community, and the public. The membership also includes at least two members from regional areas of the United States, and education and research representatives. With the exception of the latter category, all members are active in administration, management, or supervision of the correctional service that they represent as Commissioners.

The original Board of Commissioners was appointed on April 6, 1974, by the ACA Board of Directors, for terms of five years. Commissioners, as stated in the Commission's *By-Laws,* are elected by the voting membership of the ACA under regular procedure with the addition of a clause that Commissioners may not succeed themselves for five years after the original term.

With the expiration of Federal Funding, the Commission will be financially independent, but its electoral procedures will remain the same. The Commission will be financially self-sustaining through accreditation fees, dues and publication sales. Thus, it will be an independent agency with a broad base of representation from the entire field of corrections.

The Commission represents, for the first time in the history of corrections, a major effort by the field itself to develop, promulgate and apply standards to correctional agencies nationwide. Accreditation of these individual agencies will insure that the field of corrections is prepared to accept the mandates of accountability to the individuals and communities served by our organizations.

To date, the Commission has developed approximately 1300 standards which are relative to the areas of adult paroling authorities, probation and parole field services, community and juvenile residential services and long term adult institutions.

The process of developing standards is a long and tedious one. Information is drawn from 125 sources by a team of consultants and Commissioners. The standards are developed and initially approved by the particular team, then field tested by the staff, and eventually submitted to the entire Commission and the ACA twenty member Committee on Standards and Accreditation to be approved for publication.

Approximately 1000 of the proposed standards have been field-tested at the federal level and in eleven states around the nation. This exposure of proposed standards to grass roots operations allows measurement against day to day correctional policy, procedure and practices, thus the finished product is a realistic, practical standard that is viable for both present and future use.

The Commission's list of past and future publications is impressive. The *Manual of Standards for Adult Parole Authorities* was published in August 1976, and the *Manual of Standards for Adult Community Residential Services* in April 1977. Other manuals will be published according to this schedule: the *Manual of Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services* in June 1977; the *Manual of Standards for Adult Long-Term Institutions* in October 1977; and the *Manual of Standards for Residential Services for Youth* in January 1978.

The Commission is not the only organization to formulate standards for Corrections, however. The National Advisory Commission and the American Bar Association have formulated standards that have been studied by various state planning agencies around the country, and adapted for implementation at local levels.

All of this study has resulted in considerable progress toward the thorough testing of these standards against current policies and procedures.

A climate of change now permeates the field of corrections because legislators are becoming increasingly aware of correctional problems and priorities. The concern felt by these officials has filtered through to citizens and administrators alike, and all are clamoring for reform and being heard by corrections administrators.

After standards are approved, adopted and published, the agencies for whom the standards apply will be invited to voluntarily participate in the accreditation process. This process, as approved by the Commission, is a three stage activity. First, an agency sends a letter of intent to the Executive Director of the Commission. Upon receipt and acceptance of the letter, the agency enters Correspondent Status. It is during this time that the agency begins self-evaluation and application of the standards with continuous consultation and assistance by the Commission. After six months the agency submits a Self-Evaluation Report and a Plan of Action by which deficiencies will be corrected.

Stage 2 begins when the Commission receives the report and the agency is admitted to Candidate Status for a period of time not to exceed one year. During this time the agency implements the Plan of Action.

The next step, or third stage, is the Application for Accreditation Status, which is the verification of compliance witht he standards by a Visiting Committee of three or more corrections professionals. Accreditation Status will be awarded if adequate compliance with standards has been attained. If deficiencies are found, consultation and assistance will continue until Accreditation Status is awarded. Accreditation Status will be awarded for periods upt to five years, but periodic self-evaluation is required as well as Visiting Committee audits.

Obviously, an invitation to participate in the accreditation process carries with it a great deal of responsibility, for the correctional administrator to work toward accreditation on a total system basis, and to continuously review and develop standards which are innovative yet practical.

The Commission seeks to maintain an ongoing liaison with over thirty national correctional organizations, federal, state and local officials, corrections professionals, the business community, and the general public to utilize their significant contributions to the accreditation process and to maintain the momentum for improvement.

This constant contact with other agencies is necessary to maintain standards that undergo continuous review and development consistent with new methods and knowledge. Thus, no standard is considered permanent, for it must not interfere with innovation and change.

The initiative to attain self-direction, accreditation, and freedom from judicial supervision lies with the correctional administrator. The ball is in our court. We will soon have our own comprehensive source documents, that will, if we choose to implement their mandates, allow the courts to once again maintain review status instead of supervisory status of those persons, agencies and facilities that we call the correctional field. We cannot postpone this vital task. The time for accountability and accreditation is now.

SECTION SIX:

JOB MARKET INFORMATION AND OFFENDER PLACEMENT

- Job Market Information
- Offender Placement

JOB MARKET INFORMATION

by Brian Richey*

The major focus of this paper is on change—fundamental, widespread and irreversible change so rapid and so complex that oftentimes we are unable to fully comprehend it and all of its implications. The changes which I am alluding to have been centered in transportation, communication, research and development, technology, education, skills, human rights, civil rights, environmental control and the role of government in international affairs to name only the more obvious. It would be naive to assume that these economic, social and political transformations could take place without having a significant impact on our economy and our people.

One of the msot striking changes in our economy in recent years has been the shift from farm to nonfarm work. Of the civilian labor force today in the United States, only about 4 in every 100 workers are engaged in farm activities. Less than ten years ago, farming accounted for nearly twice that number; and hardly more than a generation ago, we had something close to an agrarian economy. But by 1980, present indications are that no more than 3 in every 100 workers will be employed in agriculture. What this means is because of our rapidly expanding, increasingly more diversified, and certainly more technologically oriented economy, the emphasis with respect to labor already has shifted away from the so-called "goods producing" industries; and the focus is on service oriented sectors of the economy. This story is essentially the same from state to state. Only the numbers tend to vary, and these are the things we must bear in mind as we plan for the future and counsel on career choices.

As a result of these developments, the occupational composition of our labor force and the skills required for each job have changed. In some cases, the changes have been so dramatic that we sometimes face a real dilemma—an abundance of job opportunities on the one hand—the people to fill them on the other—but inability to always bring the two together. While this situation sometimes is due to demographic differences; more often than not, it signifies a notable disparity between job requirements and qualifications of job seekers. We always have had this kind of disparity and probably always will have it. It is just that during periods of rapid economic growth and technological change, such as we have experienced in recent years, the problem is more acute than at other times.

Our nation is spending billions of dollars each year on research and development. While much of this expenditure goes for work in medicine, space, and defense its "spinoff" influences technology and production in many other fields. Effective research and development necessarily creates forms of obsolescence—obsolescence in the materials we use, the methods we employ, and the products we produce. In time, other materials, methods, and new products likely will replace those that have become outmoded or scarce as is the case for oil; but in the final analysis, with respect to labor, only those who are prepared for change will be in a good position to survive in an economic sense. What I am suggesting is that it is not enough to find and secure a job. We must prepare to hold onto it.

---

*Brian Richey is Regional Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, Dallas, Texas.

From all of this, one could and should conclude that the technological revolution ongoing in this nation is a natural consequence of research and development. Automation and computers represent only some of its most obvious manifestations. Ironically, both of these are relatively new facets of modern technology and probably only at the beginning stages of development. As I recall, it has been barely twenty-five years since the first computer was successfully installed for commercial operation, but they already have invaded banks, insurance companies, colleges and universities, most government agencies, and business in general; and if we are to continue to grow and to prosper as a nation, perhaps this is as it should be for these are merely the signs of our time. What we must learn to do is to use these tools rather than be used by them which is so often the case.

Just as research and development has led to new technologies, these in turn have led to what might be termed as "skill revolution"; because, in the long run, the jobs which are expanding and changing the skill distribution of the labor force are the so-called "bright future" jobs. Many of them are white collared, and they are scattered throughout both the public and private sectors of our economy. If there are distinguishing characteristics, it is that most if not all of these jobs require more and more education and training. I cannot overemphasize the importance of job preparation.

Over long periods of time, we tend to favor technological development and its attendance changes, for with it has come expansion in investment, consumption, and job opportunities. Our living standards have risen, and we now have more leisure time than ever before.

Over short periods of time, however, job opportunities always have not expanded sufficiently to match the growth in the number of people seeking work. This is particularly true for small labor areas where employment opportunities may be somewhat limited.

For many years, manpower policy in the United States has been directed toward the maximum development and utilization of all our human resources. Every piece of national legislation dealing with these issues as far back as the MDTA in the early '60's and as recent as the CETA–1973 includes explicit references to the need to develop a comprehensive system of information on manpower requirements and resources to discharge that policy. Indeed, the most recent amendment to the Vocational Education Act requires that such a system be developed and used.

This is why our thinking and planning for the future, with respect to labor, must be in a different frame of reference than a decade ago; because if we are to come anywhere near achieving the goals of maximum development and utilization of all our human resources, then effective planning and programming to improve the quality of labor has to represent one of our major manpower challenges.

Secretary Marshall, at a recent meeting in Baton Rouge, pointed out that what our nation loses in a given day because of unemployment and other forms of underutilization of labor represents permanent losses–permanent in the sense that they cannot be restored. He reasoned that these were losses we could ill afford as a nation if we are to continue to grow and prosper. He seemed to be making a rather strong case for both private industry and government to do more to insure that our labor markets function as efficiently as possible. In the past, he has made repeated references to intervening in labor markets to make them function more efficiently. Frankly, I am intrigued by the idea, for I believe it has tremendous potential–potential which we have not even begun to realize at this point.

The issues though are so intricate, because we are dealing with a complex variable influenced not only by economic forces but by social and political forces as well. It is important to remember that all of these forces are constantly at work but seldom in concert.

It is obvious that we cannot operate in a vacuum of information concerning our economy or our people. Right now, within our own ranks, there is a growing demand for knowledge about the shape of the future with respect to human resources; and we lack answers to so many of the questions which are being raised every day. Together, we must do something about this situation.

Over a year ago, an agreement entitled "Interagency Agreement for the Development of Occupational Manpower Education" was issued jointly by the U.S. Office of Education, the Employment and Training Administration, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It was only a three page document but very well written. It included references to such things as cooperation, coordination, and communication. Moreover, it encouraged conferences and discussions like we are having here today. I would like to reiterate some basic points outlined in that agreement:

The agency heads agreed:

1. To develop an occupational information system which would satisfy the needs of all major users of these data at the national, state and local levels.
2. To coordinate research and development activities to avoid duplication of effort and maximize the use of available resources.
3. To establish standard concepts, definitions and procedures.
4. To work toward developing a systematic approach to assessing and delivering information on manpower demand and supply and finally,
5. To raise the level of understanding of specific occupational information.

Where are we at this point? It is important to note that until just a few years ago, about the only occupational information available to anyone was the limited data derived from decennial census enumerations. That is not enough to do what needs to be done in the area of human resource development.

I am pleased to report that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has developed a new technique for estimating and projecting occupational demand by industry. We call it the Industry Occupational Matrix approach, and it shows great promise. We have prepared a sound/slide presentation which explains the concept and how it works. If you are interested in the Industry-Occupational Matrix approach and would like to view the presentation, feel free to let us know so we can provide you with whatever we have.

A MODEL FOR JOB DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY AWARENESS FOR HIRING THE EX-OFFENDER

by **Edward Gallagher***

In 1972, the Massachusetts Legislature passed an Omnibus Correctional Bill, known as Chapter 777, which allows inmates who are within eighteen months of parole eligibility, to become eligible for work or education release. Henceforth, came the first pre-release center for corrections in Massachusetts. Located on the grounds of the Boston State Hospital, this unit houses fifty men. A position was then created at the center for an employment coordinator, to which I was assigned.

My first activity was to run an open house and invite several personnel directors, employment managers, and employment representatives from all over the greater Boston area. We explained the new law and asked these businessmen and women to become part of the new program and give some of these men an opportunity to prove themselves. The success was overwhelming. We then formed the Boston Pre-Release Steering Committee, made up of various companies such as Westinghouse, Proctor and Gamble, and New England Nuclear to mention a few; and such institutions as Harvard, MIT, and Tufts University. This was the beginning of business involvement with the Department of Correction. Within two weeks everyone in the center was working, and three years later, with sixteen centers, the steering committee is still alive and flourishing providing a valuable link into the world of work.

In addition to the steering committee, there have been some other promotional projects. One was the "Your Day in Court" project. We arranged for and sent out actual legal subpeonas to personnel managers and directors of various companies, signed by a judge and sent by registered mail. The impact of this technique was to bring individuals into the reality of where and how it all starts; taking them through the whole process in the court system. They sat in on arraignments and actual trials. They saw people sentenced or put on probation. For many this was their first exposure to the criminal justice system. It is much like the use of the 2X4 over someone's head—the subpeona gets their attention. Now they were interested. The door was opened. It gave us an opportunity to push our work release program, and I have yet to see any businessman or woman who attended one of those sessions not show interest. However, I must mention that people do get alarmed when they receive one of those subpeonas, and we received many calls from various companies wondering why their people were going to court. We attempted not to give it away, but in some cases we had to. Yet they still came and enjoyed everyone else's reaction.

Another appropriate way of job developing is to have monthly conferences held at various companies and institutions. This brings together people in the same industries or professions. For instance, we have had, in the last few months, conferences at MIT and Tufts. At MIT we had approximately eighty personnel staff from various hospitals, and at Tufts, we had approximately seventy-five colleges, universities, and career schools in attendance. Again, these conferences are to promote the hiring of the ex-offender. In all cases, we have personnel people from the group speak on our behalf where they have had previous success with our manpower office, and the hiring of our work-releases. Also we have ex-offenders who are currently employed, speak on what a difference the job has made to them. In each instance, the sponsoring company or institution pays for a small luncheon so that everyone can get acquainted on an informal basis.

---

*Edward Gallagher is Director of Manpower, Massachusetts Department of Correction.

I believe that we have tried just about every way possible to promote jobs and community relations. Keep in mind that without the businessman and without the community program, you go nowhere. Another fine job development effort started three years ago with the establishment of the first job mart for ex-offenders. In Massachusetts, since this has become an annual event, the department, in conjunction with other state and county agencies, brings each year to Boston, this highly successful program for men and women still incarcerated on work release and those on probation and parole. We consider it to be a most progressive step taken in our endeavor to seek meaningful employment for those men and women who are a "forgotten minority."

There have been approximately 250-300 companies represented in individual booths and in attendance at the major seminar which precedes the mart itself. The booths, of course, are manned by personnel staff who interview and inform applicants of the opportunities and advantages of being an employee in their particular company.

It is clear that meaningful employment plays in important role in the successful reintegration and rehabilitation of ex-offenders. The job mart is a mechanism through which both employers and ex-offenders can attack the problem of matching available manpower with available jobs. The mart serves as the forum in which employers will be informed of the existence of, and advantages attached to the manpower resource defined by clients of the criminal justice system. The ex-offender is afforded the opportunity to plug into a centrally located source of jobs in a way which also initiates the needed coordination and cooperation within the system.

The job mart serves as a clearinghouse for all the parties concerned with employment and training of ex-offenders. It establishes working relationships through which information and resources may be exchanged throughout the year. It also enlists the cooperation and participation of all CETA prime sponsors, and any other appropriate private and public organization. In the business sector, Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM), National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB), Chambers of Commerce, Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, and other professional business affiliations are recruited to promote this endeavor. But the most important and final aspect, of course, is to match job openings with interested available applicants. The National Alliance of Businessmen, realizing this and in conjunction with the Department of Correction sponsored two major governors conferences on hiring the ex-offender this past year.

At this event, persons who work in the criminal justice system, and ex-offenders themselves have a unique opportunity to dispell many of the fears and misconceptions commonly associated with getting and keeping a job. Tax credits and on the job training contract advantages can be presented to the employers as well as the work release system with detailed explanation.

The job mart consists of three distinct functions held over a two day period. On the first day, a seminar is arranged for the participating companies so that their representatives may be better informed about the ex-offender as an employee. Panels representing local companies who have had experience with ex-offender employees, correctional personnel, ex-offenders and offender related manpower agencies speak about their own experiences and answer questions. The seminar is an important forum for the overall program since it allows the employers to obtain specific information from persons who are directly involved in all aspects of the process.

Later, on the same day, the employers are invited to attend a dinner in which they can meet the panelists on an informal basis. Prominent speakers encourage the participants to follow through on their good intentions by hiring ex-offenders on the following day. The dinner helps to set a productive tone for the job mart and easily creates an atmosphere of goodwill which can later be utilized to the benefit of the ex-offender applicants.

On the second day, the most important business of the job mart takes place. Each of the participating companies is provided with a 5' x 8' booth in which their personnel representatives can interview prospective employees. Because extensive public relations work is done in advance and all the public and private agencies with ex-offender clients are notified, large numbers of ex-offenders have their first realistic exposure to usual employment recruiting and hiring procedures. Even though everyone is not hired on the spot, important contacts are made that can lead to long-term meaningful employment.

It must be mentioned that each participating company pays its own way to these job marts. This shows their intention to be a part of a program to assist in employment of ex-offenders.

Because of the positive response in Massachusetts to the job mart concept, we believe the concept might be enthusiastically received in other states. It has often been industries' complaint that job development efforts on behalf of the disadvantaged are confusing, wasteful, and repletive. Business may be receptive to the idea of hiring the ex-offender, but it is tired of being barraged by the many competing agencies who represent offenders. The business community is conscious of this serious social problem and wants to be involved. They need to be shown. The job mart is an opportunity to being together the employers, manpower agencies, and the ex-offender applicants in an organized format so that the needs of each may best be served.

Given the correct training and employer attitudes, ex-convicts can become better than average employees, and the employers in many areas are beginning to realize this fact.

OFFENDER JOB PLACEMENT

by John Nunnery*

When the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 established the present nationwide public employment service system, it did not specify ex-offenders as a target group for services. However, in its basic role as a labor exchange, the employment service clearly has always had a responsibility to serve the ex-offender who is seeking work. Therefore, the Department of Labor has had a concern for the placement of ex-offenders for over forty years. The Department has not solved the problems involved in placing the ex-offender, for if it had, there would be no need for this panel. The Department has made a number of significant efforts in the past fifteen years. I would like to talk first of all about the nationwide efforts of the Department to serve ex-offenders, and then to focus on the current programs in Illinois.

Rehabilitation of the ex-offender is a national problem. About 1½ million persons are in the nation's correctional system any given day. About one-third are incarcerated, either at the federal, state, or local level, with the remaining two-thirds being on probation and parole. Every year, more than 100,000 offenders are released from federal and state prisons. To give you an idea of the scale of the problem in relation to the United States Employment Service, that is one-third more job seekers than the Illinois State Employment Service placed in the last fiscal year.

The Department of Labor began to devote specific attention to the problems of offenders and ex-offenders under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2571), as amended (MDTA). The primary thrust of the MDTA funding was in research and demonstration efforts through pilot projects.

These pilot projects fell into five basic categories: (1) inmate training, (2) the model ex-offender program (concentrating on job placement), (3) pre-trial intervention, (4) bonding ex-offenders, and (5) coordination efforts among federal, state and local agencies concerned with rehabilitating offenders. The Department of Labor expended over $60 million dollars for such programs between 1969-1974. With over 400 CETA prime sponsors now mandated to provide services to ex-offenders, it is likely that at least the same level of funding has been maintained.

As I will discuss later, many of the separate programs have been coordinated in comprehensive programs in some states. However, it will still be useful to discuss them briefly.

Inmate training began in 1966 and developed slowly. Between 1968 and 1974, the Department spent over $28 million primarily in state institutions. Inadequate data and the difficulty of locating offenders released from parole requirements has hampered a thorough evaluation but it is clear that training is essential for the offender with little or no skills.

---

*John Nunnery is Administrator with the Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor (Region V), Chicago, Illinois.

The Model Ex-Offender Program which focuses on job placement was begun in five states—Arizona, Georgia, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania—in 1971. In 1975, the Department established such a program in one state in each region, with funds from Title III-A of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and a required match of local funds.

Pre-trial intervention also began in 1971 with a similar shift to one project per region with CETA involvement in 1975. The hope is that the projects will provide appropriate models for local prime sponsors to include in their manpower plans.

The Federal Bonding Program, which began in ten states and four cities in 1966 has been one of the most successful programs. In 1971, the program was extended to over 2,200 local employment service offices, who can secure bonds up to $10,000 for ex-offenders and others considered poor employment risks. Over 9,000 individuals have been placed as a result of the program and the forfeiture rate has been only 1.8 percent. Approximately 1,200 individuals are in the program at any one time.

The Comprehensive Offender Manpower Program to coordinate federal, state, and community agencies began in 1971 and eventually covered eight states. A major portion of the funding for these programs has now shifted to the state level.

The Comprehensive Offender Program Effort was also designed to coordinate federal, state and local resources devoted to offender rehabilitation. Six states were selected to participate in May of 1975 but no conclusive results are yet available.

As you have heard, the Department of Labor has tried a wide range of research and demonstration projects to find ways of alleviating the difficult problem of ex-offender placement. There has been a significant change in funding with the passage of CETA in 1974, and much of the responsibility now falls on the local prime sponsor. It appears that they are meeting the challenge and providing a significant number of training slots and funding for ex-offenders. The Secretary of Labor also has funds under Title III of CETA which have been used to establish or continue pilot projects. It is clear that the Department will continue to have a concern on both the national and local level.

As I have indicated, the Department of Labor has recognized that the employment problems of offenders are of such an extreme and unique nature that special programs designed to meet the specific problems of that target group have been funded on a regular basis. One such model problem worthy of close scrutiny and possible replication or adaptation in other areas is the Comprehensive Offender Manpower (COMP) in the State of Illinois.

The Illinois COMP program, which is administered by the Department of Corrections, provides a comprehensive array of manpower services to law offenders. The basic assumption embodied in each of its program efforts is that by providing manpower services you remove the economic incentive for crime. The manpower services that the Illinois COMP provides have two major objectives:

1. To enhance the employability of law offenders through vocational and prevocational training, academic education and counseling, and
2. To enhance the employment performance of law offenders by providing direct job placement and related follow-up services.

While enhancing employability and employment performance are the major program thrusts of the COMP program, it is important to recognize the reasons behind the different points of intervention in the criminal justice system of the various projects that constitute the COMP program. In general, three points of intervention are available:

1. Program services may be delivered before incarceration and may offer an alternative to incarceration in an institution.
2. Program services may be delivered in a correctional institution.
3. Program services may be delivered after release from an institution.

The programs that intervene at point 2 (instructional setting) address the objective of enhancing employability and providing vocational and prevocational training as well as individual counseling. The institutional setting provides many difficulties to the effective delivery of program services and as a consequence, a proportionately higher share of program dollars goes for programs that intervene at points 1 and 3.

Incidentally, on the subject of funding, COMP serves as a good example of how funds from various sources can be effectively pooled to forge a stronger program. Funding for COMP breaks out as follows:

CETA Special Grant to Governor	$1.9 million
CETA local prime sponsors	900,000
CETA Title III	270,000
LEAA	500,000
Illinois Community College Board	200,000
State Department of Corrections	400,000
Private funds	100,000

The strategy on funding has been to shift a greater proportion of funding to local sources. This fiscal year, the local CETA prime sponsor share of the program was about 26 percent. Next year, that will increase to 45 percent. The only sure way that this can happen is for the project to sell itself through positive outcomes for participants. I think you will agree that this has been the case as I relate the following program data:

> Since its inception two years ago, roughly 10,000 individuals have been enrolled in the program. Of the 8,500 terminations to date, 3,300 have been placed into jobs and 2,100 have had other positive terminations.
>
> In addition, a recently completed costs benefit study of one of the components of COMP yields a ratio of 6.56. In other words, for every dollar in resources put into the program, the effect of the manpower service can be expected to yield benefits of $6.56 to government and/or society.

Why has this program been so successful where many others have failed? Or, to speak directly to the question posed as the purpose of this workshop—"How do you find jobs for inmates who have completed vocational programs while incarcerated?" I think the real key in the Illinois program's success is that the system of vocational training in institutions has been well plugged into the external systems (community-based employment programs) whose focus is on job placement. Too often in the past, vocational programs in institutions have existed in a vacuum. Training has been given without regard to actual job openings in communities to which ex-offenders have been released. Placement services have been underemphasized and information systems have failed to provide data on job openings in the "external world." COMP has closed this gap.

The program design which allows for this is the utilization of the Vocational Counseling Program in the adult penitentiaries to serve as a referral linkage to community-based employment programs. The Vocational Counseling Program is designed to service law offenders who need to acquire career direction and/or job seeking/retention skills. It has accredited curriculum and is offered for college credit at the state's correctional institutions. Basically the program divides into three phases:

- The first phase focuses on expanding the client's awareness of the world of work and the demands that employers will place on a prospective applicant in each of several potential career areas;
- The second phase of the curriculum emphasizes narrowing the client's vocational options to arrive at a particular career area towards which a client will strive;
- The third phase of the curriculum is designed to facilitate the development and implementation of an action plan for acquiring and retaining employment after release in the skill area which the client had indicated is his area of greatest interest.

The Vocational Counseling Program, while philosophically very important to the COMP design, is not, of course, the largest single area of funding for manpower programs within the state penitentiary system. Far larger than the Vocational Counseling Program is the state's effort to provide for the upgrading of the vocational and academic skills of law offenders within the penitentiaries. Illinois is one of only a few states in the country which has legally constituted its Adult Division as a School District. By creating a correctional school district, Illinois has set up a system for education which meets most of the same standards of quality and content as do civilian correctional school districts. In the main, remedial academic services are provided through accredited educators on the staff of the correctional school district, while vocational services are contracted out to the state's community college system. The state community college system operates "remote attendance centers" at the state correctional institutions in which programs—using the same curriculum as those at the "home" campus of the community college—are taught. This arrangement is designed to maximize the educational return for each dollar invested and, although in its formative years, it seems a most productive way to organize educational services within a penitentiary setting.

Complimenting the academic and vocational career counseling services within the penitentiaries are services designed to reintegrate law offenders upon release. The most significant of these are:

1. Job-seeking furloughs: which are provided for by statute by the United Code of Corrections to facilitate the job acquisition of soon-to-be-released ex-offenders.
2. Work-release centers to provide an opportunity for the gradual integration of law offenders, particularly those who have been institutionalized for an extended period of time.
3. Half-way houses for law offenders who need housing immediately upon release.
4. Emergency loan and loans for the purchase of tools and immediate referral to other social services, including such sources as public aid, housing, and drug programs.

As can readily be seen, a substantial number and variety of services are available both at the community correctional level and at the state correctional level.

With respect to the linkage with community-based employment programs, clients are considered "enrolled" in the ex-offender program when they are about thirty days from release.

At the heart of the coordinating system for the Illinois program is a statewide computer network revolving around terminals in each of the seven cities in which job development and placement is undertaken. This computer system is able to "read" from a data base established by the Vocational Counseling Program including records on each client about to be released and highlights data elements which have occupational impact (previous occupational history, experience and training while incarcerated, the terms and conditions of parole, etc.). When offenders are scheduled for discharge, the computer system automatically generates a roster of clients who are to be released to each of the seven cities during a two week period. That roster automatically prints out at each of those seven locations on the first and tenth working days of each month. That roster serves as an "early warning system" for the job developers and counselors in those communities and gives them a clear picture of the kinds of job interests and aspirations held by persons about to be discharged to their jurisdictions. On the basis of the interest outlined, the job development office transmits to the penitentiary information on job openings in the career areas which are of interest to each client. By the client's receiving feedback on his interests from the job development service agency in the city to which he is returning, he is more likely to rapidly avail himself of service after release.

Maximum use is made of existing CETA job development and placement resources both through the prime sponsors and through the State of Illinois acting as the prime sponsor. In addition, the Illinois program involves employers in a wide variety of other roles which will be supportive of the basic mission of job placement and retention, but which will also have subsidiary benefits in a number of areas.

One of the most important ways in which the program utilizes employers is through involving employers in the development and implementation of job-readiness training at the institutions. Additionally, employers are involved through the advisory boards of the several community colleges which provide job readiness training cooperatively with the Vocational Counseling Program at the major institutions.

As can be seen from this rather brief description, the Illinois program is truly a coordinated effort involving a broad range of agencies involved in training and employment placement. It is this coordinated approach which has led to its success.

For further information, either of the following persons are directly involved:

- Ed Maier
  Illinois Department of Corrections
  120 South Riverside Plaza
  Chicago
  (312) 454 1560

- Gary Weisman
  ETA – Correctional Programs
  601 "D" St., N.W.
  Washington, D.C.
  (202) 376 6774

SECTION SEVEN:

OFFENDER NEEDS AND INTERESTS

- Adult Offender Needs and Interests
- Juvenile Offender Needs and Interests
- Offender Needs in Short-Term Institutions

WISCONSIN'S MUTUAL AGREEMENT PROGRAM

by Russel Leik*

While the assigned task of this paper is to discuss from the Mutual Agreement Program (MAP) perspective sound procedures that are available tc assess vocational needs of adult offenders, it should be made clear that the Mutual Agreement Program is not basically an assessment mechanism in and of itself, but is a systematic procedure, which times the completion of programs, including vocational, with an offender's reintegration into the community.

Efforts directed toward coordinating confined offender's activities with the goal of reintegration into the community received increased emphasis in 1967 with the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. As a result of this increased emphasis, the American Correctional Association at a joint meeting of correctional administrators and paroling authorities in 1972 at New Orleans discussed the problem of coordination between these two respective areas of responsibility in an effort to identify problems common to each and to develop a mechanism for planned change as they both worked toward the common goal of reintegration of the offender.

A concept called Mutual Agreement Programming (MAP) identified as the mechanism by which the correctional administrators and the paroling authorities would coordinate their efforts, identify common needs, and implement planned change resulted from the joint workshop in New Orleans. The primary tool envisioned to bring about mutual agreement was negotiations involving the institution, parole authority, and resident which would result in a legally binding agreement.

The concept of negotiating an offender's activities within a correctional system, let alone negotiating a release date in advance based on projected and agreed to activities, was indeed a unique phenomenon at that time. The American Correctional Association funded three experimental programs in Arizona, California, and Wisconsin to determine how such a concept could be implemented and to assess its results.

Wisconsin, which at that time had a correctional administrator who was also the chairman of the Parole Board, decided to implement the ACA's experimental program at its medium security facility, the Wisconsin Correctional Institution at Fox Lake. The eighteen month experimental phase began in the fall of 1972 and involved approximately 200 residents of this one facility.

The general feeling among the administrators of the Wisconsin Division of Corrections was that the MAP program held considerable potential for tying together a guarantee of specific programs and a specific release date. It was felt that the process held potential for utilizing available resources to the maximum, provided the offender with a voice regarding activities during the period of confinement, and provided a definite release date upon completion of the agreed-upon program. The decision was made to implement MAP on a statewide basis in all of Wisconsin's adult correctional facilities. A three year Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grant was requested and approved through the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice beginning in the fall of 1974.

---

*Russel Leik is Supervisor of Wisconsin's Mutual Agreement Program, Madison, Wisconsin.

MAP teams consisting of a MAP Coordinator, a MAP Institution Representative and clerical staff, were phased in at all of the Division's adult correctional institutions with the last team being phased in March of this year in the Wisconsin Correctional Camp System, a system of minimum security facilities located throughout the state. The LEAA grant is in its third and final year of funding with August 31, 1977 being the completion of the federal grant. The program is currently in the executive budget for 100 percent pickup on state funds beginning in July 1977 and it is anticipated that there will be a favorable response by the legislature in providing the requested funds.

In Wisconsin today, MAP is defined as a voluntary process of exchange whereby the resident, institution, and parole board agree on a certain date for parole upon completion of specified goals. This system of exchange is sustained in a negotiating process requiring resident responsibility, institution accountability, and specifically stated parole criteria. The end result of this exchange is a legally binding document between the resident and the state.

Entry into MAP takes place through the resident's assigned social worker within the institution. The social worker's initial responsibility is to determine eligibility for MAP which is as follows:

- A five year sentence or less, thirty days after admission or upon completion of assessment and evaluation;
- Over a five year sentence, after first parole hearing or in the case of a life sentence, after serving eight years and three months of this sentence.

Following a positive eligibility determination the social worker develops a referral to the MAP system utilizing the reports and evaluation of the Assessment and Evaluation Center, the resident's own interests, the needs as expressed by the offender's assigned parole agent and his/her own assessment of the resident's needs. The vocational assessment and evaluation involves vocational testing utilizing the general aptitude test battery, non-reading aptitude test battery and the California Interest Inventory. Other tests such as the Strong Vocational Interest Inventory and Bennett Mechanical Comprehension are given on an individualized basis when appropriate. The Singer/Graflex Vocational Evaluation System provide further refinements in assessing the offender's vocational needs if needed. The MAP referral when completed is sent to the MAP Coordinator at that institution.

The first component of the MAP proposal is that of skilled training or vocational training. Using the referral developed by the resident's social worker, the resident himself and the available training programs within the Bureau of Institutions, the Coordinator addresses the issue of the individual's needs in the area of skill or vocational training. This could include developing a completely new skill, improving upon existing skills or, if an individual is already skilled in a particular trade, helping him to develop a related trade if it is available and the resident requests it.

Work assignments is the next component of the proposal. Attempts are made to place individuals in work assignment areas which have a relationship to the skilled training that is requested. This is usually done in the form of a statement that the individual will accept any institution job preferably in the area of his stated skill training.

The third component of the MAP proposal is that of academic education and includes such areas as adult basic education, high school or college. In the area of adult basic education the component is usually written so as to require a specific level of improvement over existing levels as tested during the assessment and evaluation process. In high school or college a specified number of semesters or credits are usually required to successfully complete this.

Treatment is the fourth component part relating to a meaningful development for the individual in the area of emotional adjustment which could include AA treatment, drug treatment, etc. Prior to any negotiations which might include treatment, an additional evaluation is completed by the Bureau of Clinical Services staff, which addresses itself specifically to the resident's needs and the possibility of accomplishment given the resident's motivation.

The fifth component part of the contract relates to conduct within the institution. This normally indicates that the resident will receive no conduct reports that might result in any major penalties. The conduct portion as it relates to major penalties is based on the resident's handbook of disciplinary proceedings which is given and explained to each individual during the assessment and evaluation or orientation process.

The sixth component part of the MAP contract refers to the transfer-security classification. This relates to the individual's requested transfer to another facility within the Bureau of Institutions to enroll either in a training program or to allow the development of a work skill which has been learned in the institution. For example, this component might include a transfer to a unit of the Wisconsin Correctional Camp System which is a minimum security facility where participation in the work release program within the community might be considered. This component usually calls for a reduction in security. A great number of contracts are written which arrange an individual's placement in a minimum security facility of the Wisconsin Correctional Camp System nearest the individual's home.

The seventh component part of the contract usually relates to other nees which have not been specifically addressed. An example is of placement on work or study release either from a major institution or within one of the units of the Wisconsin Correctional Camp System. If this is in the area of study release, a specific time and approval is included in the contract which states that on a certain date the individual will be approved for the study release program and will be placed within a particular educational program in the community. If the component relates to work release, usually the statement is included which indicates that he will be reviewed by the Camp System's Program Review Committee for approval for work release on a specific date. (Actual work placement depends on job availability.)

The final part of the MAP proposal and perhaps the most important as far as the resident is concerned is the target parole date. A date is proposed through the resident's estimate and the experience of the MAP Coordinator as it relates to his experiences with other contracts and the MAP panel's reaction to them. If the resident does not agree with the MAP Coordinator's assessment of an acceptable target parole date, the date which the resident requests will be retained in the formal proposal and offered for negotiations. This target parole date obviously is affected by the various training programs that the individual is requesting and the timetable in which these classes can be taken. In addition, the normal parole criteria considered by the Parole Board for a parole applicant is considered, such as length of sentence, offense, and community reaction.

Upon completion, the MAP proposal is sent to the MAP Institution Representative who must check that the requested programs and services are available and deliverable somewhere within the Bureau of Institutions. In addition, if a treatment component is included, the proposal is sent to the Bureau of Clinical Services staff for a clinical evaluation of the individual's treatment needs and motivation. The resident's parole agent in the community is also sent a copy of the proposal to ascertain the relevance of the program for the individual involved and the agent's opinion as to how the program developed and completed within the institution will be continued upon the individual's release into the home community. For example, if the trade that the individual has requested is one which, in this particular community, is in surplus as determined by the State Employment Service and the individual agent's experiences in placing other individuals, the agent is expected to so advise and perhaps suggest an alternative skill training area that the resident might consider given the needs of the community and the individual interests of the resident. In addition, the agent is expected to react to all component parts of the contract where the agent may feel specific accomplishments must be met before a successful reintegration into the community can be accomplished.

In addition to the individuals listed above, copies of the MAP proposal go also to the resident, social worker, and the Parole Board. Once the proposal has been cleared by the MAP Institution Representative as to availability of services requested, clinical services evaluation of treatment needs, and the parole agent's evaluation, the case is scheduled for negotiation.

Participants in the negotiation activity are two members of the Parole Board, the MAP Institution Representative, MAP Coordinator, and resident. While each member may address areas within any part of negotiation, the usual role responsibility of the Parole Board members relate to areas of parole ability given the resident's agreement to complete the training program as specified. The MAP Institution Representative usually addresses the issue of the availability of the programs requested, the time sequence in which they are presented, and the opinions of Clinical Services staff and parole agents. The MAP Coordinator represents the resident during negotiation and assures that fair negotiations are in fact occurring, signing a recommendation to the Department Secretary to that effect. The resident presents a proposed training program which will meet his/her needs for re-entering the community and to specifying a certain date for re-entry if this program is completed.

Negotiations are conducted on a face to face basis with the MAP panel and the resident seated around one table with the resident proposing the contract with the MAP Institution Representative and the Parole Board offering counter proposals as they see necessary. The actual negotiations usually take from twenty minutes to a half hour and are a give and take of opinion as viewed from each respective person's point of view.

Three possible outcomes can occur as a result of the negotiation. First, there can be mutual agreement of the MAP panel and the resident as to the component parts of the contract and the target release date.

The second result of MAP negotiations may be a continuation. The resident may wish to give further consideration to counter proposals made during the negotiations. The MAP Institution Representative may need to ascertain if different training or other programs suggested during counter proposals are in fact available and whether the timetable of these would fit into the resident's contract parameters.

The third result of the MAP negotiations is a failure to agree. This occurs when the resident and the MAP panel are unable to reach agreement. The resident may resubmit a proposal again in ninety days or upon a specified date as stated by the MAP panel.

Upon signing of the MAP contract, monitoring of the contract is closely followed to ensure that the agreed upon components of the contract are in fact completed as agreed upon. Monitoring, the primary responsibility of the Institution Representative takes several forms. First, it is routinely done by the individuals who are providing the services requested in the contract, by the resident's social worker in his routine contacts with the resident, and at least every six months by the Institution

Program Review Committee who routinely sees all residents and evaluates their program within the facility.

At anytime during the life of the contract any individual who is a signator to the contract, or who recommends to the Secretary, can appeal any dispute which arises. The appeal process is a three-step process. The first step is submitting a statement to the MAP Supervisor. Following a decision by the MAP Supervisor, the individual appealing the dispute may appeal the MAP Supervisor's decision to the Department's Secretary's office who further reviews the matter. The decision by the Department Secretary is final and binding except that the decision can be submitted to the Dane County Circuit Court for review of the process to determine whether it was arbitrary or capricious. With approximately 650 contracts currently in force, approximately 20 appeals monthly are filed with the MAP Supervisor with about one-half finally appealed to the Department Secretary for resolution. Following that level of appeal approximately one case per month is filed with the Dane County Circuit Court for review as being arbitrary or capricious. In all cases thus far MAP procedure has been upheld as valid.

It is felt that MAP as described above has impacted the vocational education system in the Division of Corrections in several ways. First, MAP has required it to be accountable for delivering the services that it has agreed to in the contract. Research shows that approximately 40 percent of the negotiated contracts have a skill training or vocational component. The four most requested trades are welding, auto mechanics, custodial maintenance and machinist.

MAP has also served as a catalyst to motivate residents to enter into and successfully complete vocational training. The resident in the MAP process is provided a devinite role in the planning of his/her activities during confinement and once a mutually agreed upon contract is signed has a definite incentive to complete the program in return for a specific release date. Research has shown that approximately 78 percent of the successfully negotiated contracts are completed.

It is felt that the Mutual Agreement Program has provided the resident the opportunity not only for a specific release date but also for vocational and other programs which he/she feels meaningful and necessary for successful reintegration into the community. This process systematizes the effective use of the resources the Division has available and provides the resident the experience of successfully planning and completing a program designed for his/her reintegration into the community.

WHAT PROCEDURES ARE AVAILABLE TO ASSESS AND CONSIDER THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NEEDS OF ADULT OFFENDERS?

by T. P. Jones*

Throughout history, as economic opportunities have expanded, man's structure for survival and bare subsistence has evolved into an effort to achieve a rewarding and meaningful existence. In our society, the search for a satisfying career is a fundamental factor in achieving this goal, and methods of evaluating work behavior and potential have assumed an increasingly important role in assisting the individual in making a sound vocational selection.

In the early 19th century, assessment efforts measured mental abilities, special aptitudes, and vocational interests. This process of vocational appraisal remained largely unchanged until the late 1950's and early 1960's, when increased national attention focused on the problems of the disadvantaged revealed the inadequacy of many traditional evaluation methods. It became evident that social and cultural differences were of prime importance in the vocational assessment process, and that the handicapped and disadvantaged individual experienced great difficulty in making realistic and meaningful occupational selections.

Study of these problems has led to the development of new assessment techniques that have proven to be more effective for the majority of our population, as well as the handicapped and disadvantaged. Methods which engage the individual in an activity relevant to his immediate needs, permitting him an opportunity to observe and perform work descriptive of actual jobs, have been demonstrated to more successfully reveal optimal career potential. An individual who is undertaking vocational-technical training must decide on the purpose of the training—a vocational goal around which a training program can be built.

Goal setting involves using a variety of resources to provide the individual with as much information as possible for making a sound decision. There are three parts to the goal-setting process: finding out what the inmate things she/he wants to do; making available to the inmate as much relevant personal information, job-related information, and job market information as possible; and giving the inmate the chance to evaluate the information and to choose a goal that best meets her/his needs.

Goals should not be set haphazardly or for the wrong reasons. For example, an inmate may hear about an opening in a welding class and decide to be a welder. Another may think nurses lead glamorous lives and decide to be a nurse, while another might want to become a secretary because she/he has an aunt who is one. Vocational goals should, instead, be carefully set, whether large or small, long-term or short-term. (A short-term goal may involve obtaining a specific job skill such as typing, carburetor adjustment, or plant propagation; goals that are larger, such as becoming a secretary, an automobile mechanic, or a nursery worker, are long-term goals.) To increase the chances that goals will be realistic for the individual, as much information as possible should be made available to the inmate. Guidance counselors, occupational specialists, and teachers can provide much information to enable realistic goal setting.

---

*T. P. Jones is Assistant Secretary for Programs, Florida Department of Offender Rehabilitation, Tallahassee, Florida.

The guidance counselor primarily provides help in the administration and interpretation of tests related to vcoational guidance. Since the guidance counselor is usually a person with advanced training and experience in testing, she/he can be an important resource for the inmate who is attempting to identify appropriate vocational goals.

Occupational specialists can also be of immense help in the goal-setting process. Typically, the occupational specialist's duties include acquiring and publicizing information on job opportunities at the local, state, and national levels; assisting the guidance counselor in implementing vocational testing programs; counseling inmates regarding vocational goals; helping inmates secure jobs; and following up those students who have been placed in jobs. Occupational specialists can provide published materials describing various jobs and job families. They can also arrange for academic, vocational, and interest evaluation as part of the goal-setting process. Occupational specialists are valuable resources for discovering the needs of the local job market, an important aspect of goal setting for many inmates.

The teacher usually understands better than anyone else the combination of skills, knowledge, and attitudes required of a worker, and, as a result, has a special role to play once an inmate has chosen a tentative long-term goal. At this stage, the teacher is primarily responsible for helping the inmate plan an appropriate educational path to that goal, often through determining short-term goals to meet immediate needs for employment. Since the demands on the teacher in the classroom or laboratory prevent devoting a lot of time to goal setting, the teacher should work closely with the other professionals in helping inmates set realistic, meaningful goals.

When setting these goals, several kinds of information need to be considered. First, personal information on the inmate identifying his/her strengths, weaknesses, interests, and needs allows realistic evaluation of alternative vocational goals. For example, such factors as age, general health of the inmate and family background, as well as an individual's prior training and experience—former jobs, educational attainments, etc.—should be examined. Also, many individuals enter a vocational program in order to meet an immediate, personal need for employability, a fact which should be taken into consideration.

Most inmates also need help in obtaining information about the nature of specific jobs they may be interested in as vocational goals. Such information includes prerequisite skills, main tasks, work conditions, training requirements, and opportunities for career development—all in relation to the particular job being considered. Finally, inmates should be informed of the job market needs and opportunities, present and future, of any job goal they may be considering. They need access to job market information of local as well as state, regional, and national levels. For example, inmates should know before goal setting is complete whether the job being considered is not available locally. Most inmates are also concerned with potential earning power and up-to-date wage and salary schedules of jobs being considered.

While the job of the teacher is not necessarily to provide or obtain all of this information, it is important that she/he makes sure that the inmate's goal setting has been soundly based on a consideration of personal characteristics and needs, knowledge of the job goal and of the training it entails, and an awareness of the market conditions in the area of the chosen vocational goal. Only when all three kinds of information have been considered should goal setting occur.

Allow me to describe what we are trying to do regarding the assessment of offenders' vocational education needs in Florida. I make no apology for using the word "trying." The size and qualifications of staff from one institution to another cause varying degrees of effectiveness in the assessment process. With an inmate population of around 18,000 and a yearly intake of over eight thousand new admissions, I cannot say that all inmates receive optimum benefits from vocational education needs assessment. However, we are trying as we look ahead to such predictions as an inmate population of 20,000 by the end of 1977 and possibly 28,000 by 1980. We know that we must learn to be more effective, more accurate, in our vocational assessment and educational programs.

An inmate admitted to the care and custody of the Florida Department of Offender Rehabilitation starts the diagnostic process at a large reception and medical center. He remains there for approximately four weeks while he undergoes extensive testing. Background data from his life prior to becoming an inmate is collected and reviewed by special case workers. Physical examinations are completed. Mental tests including groups intelligence and achievement tests are administered as well as individual psychological evaluations. During these first few weeks the staff begins to form a team approach, collecting and sharing information about the inmate with the team and with the inmate.

Correctional institutions in Florida, as is the case in most states, vary a great deal in size, custody classification, and programs available. The diagnostic process at the reception and medical center is aimed only at getting enough information to decide which institutional assignment appears to be most appropriate for each inmate. When this is determined, the inmate is transferred to the selected institution if there is bed space available. I admit freely that this is where Florida's classification process has often broken down in the last couple of years.

The orientation and assessment process is continued after the inmate arrives at his assigned institution. The collected data with recommendations is forwarded along with the inmate. If the receiving institution has reason to question the validity of test results, additional tests may be administered. Generally, the beta IQ is used as a measure of ability. For several years, the Gray-Votaw-Rogers test of achievement has been used as a guide for the inmate's functioning level. Presently, institutions are shifting from the GVR to the tabe or test of adult basic education published by California Test Bureau.

All inmates who have at least sixth grade reading skills are given the GATB or General Aptitude Test Battery. From this we derive the occupational aptitude patterns an inmate possesses and these are compared to our vocational education course selection criteria. Several institutions use the Kuder Vocational Preference Inventory and at least one institution uses the strong vocational interest inventory. We administer these additional tests the first week the inmate is in the institution and then use the results along with an interview as a motivational technique.

Florida has recently developed a program plan for dealing with youthful offenders that we feel has strong implications for older inmates as well. This is a four phase program developed and centered around vocational or occupational goals. It is geared toward providing an employable skill to each inmate needing such training and to offer remedial learning activities in support of his occupational goals.

Phase I Exploration of the World of Work

All inmates are programmed through a short term exploration phase which provides an opportunity, through a multi media approach, to visually learn of the various occupations, the skills required and job opportunities available. This phase of the program is of short duration (not exceeding two weeks) and provides occupational information through films, slides, video tape and written materials.

Phase II – Work Sampling

Upon completion of the exploration phase of the education program which acquaints the youthful offender generally with various types of occupations existing in the world of work, the offender is then placed in a work sampling program in order to be involved in "hands on" experiences in various job skills. During this phase of the education program, an occupational plan is developed with each offender which he pursues both in the institution and hopefully upon release.

The occupational exploration and work sampling center support the learing lab and overall education program by providing inmates with access to a variety of the latest occupational information related to career selection, job survival skills, and vocational aptitudes for selected career areas.

Inmates entering the institution will first be guided through an occupational exploration program using a variety of materials such as career guidance kits, occupational literature, trade journals, etc. The program will emphasize individual attention and self-exploration as well.

After inmates complete the occupational exploration program, they will be guided through the work sampling program using a series of "hands-on" activities designed to acquaint them with various job requirements and assess individual aptitudes. Once aptitudes for selected job areas have been identified, they will be provided with additional instruction in job survival skills and employability training.

As a result of these programs, a complete profile of each participant's strengths and weaknesses will be available. This will assist in further developing the occupation best suited for the inmate and the education and occupational goal that he should pursue, both in the institution and when released.

Phase III – Occupational Lab

Upon completion of Phase II, which should result in the development of an occupational plan, the offender is assigned to an occupational lab where he pursues vocational training according to the plan developed as a result of the work sampling and testing and diagnostic activities.

Inmates participate in daily classroom activities in selected occupational training areas which have been chosen on the basis of the occupational exploration and work sampling center's assessment or other aptitude identification process. Instruction consists of formal classroom participation, hands-on activities, and on-the-job training experiences that utilize a variety of equipment and material. The training is designed to provide trainees with salable entry level skills so as to enable them to enter and compete successfully in the world of work.

Phase IV – Learning Lab

Upon assignment to an occupational lab, the trainee is assigned to learning center activities in order to provide the remedial academic instruction in pursuit of his occupational goals. For instance, some trainees might need to become functionally literate and are assigned to the learning lab only for one hour a day. Others might need tenth grade equivalency and perhaps might be assigned two or more hours a day. Some offenders, because of their occupational goals, would need to obtain a high school diploma and, therefore, should be enrolled in a GED preparatory program and be assigned one half day in the learning lab.

The learning lab program is an individualized training system for delivery of remedial and related training with emphasis on providing the trainee the necessary academic instruction to pursue his occupational goals. The lab diagnoses specific learning difficulties and prepares individualized prescriptions to treat those learning difficulties. This systematized program of individualized instruction is designed to enhance the development of basic skills in reading, mathematics, and written and oral communications. This instruction will be flexible enough to account for those who have not been successful at formal group isntruction. A trainee may be assigned to this lab part of a day and spend the rest of the day in the occupational lab.

The above are some of the ideas that come to me as I consider the assessment of vocational education needs of offenders.

VOCATIONAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

by Grady A. Decell*

A great percentage of normal adolescents and young adults today do not know what they want to do in life. Some will never find job contentment throughout their working lives and therefore never attain the happiness, fulfillment, job security and job satisfaction that might be theirs under different circumstances. For many, entry into the world of work is a trying experience, especially into an unknown environment without sufficient basic skills, such as the ability to read, write, and perform basic mathematical calculations, or specific job skills.

Society is becoming more and more mobile—changes are occurring at a rate never before seen. In only a portion of our lifetime, employment mobility has expanded to the point that the average person may change jobs six (6) or more times during his lifetime. Jobs exist now that were not even thought of ten (10) years ago, and new jobs with corresponding skill requirements are emerging everyday. In the 1965 edition of the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles,* there are 22,000 jobs defined which include over 30,000 job titles. This is even now under revision and should certainly show decided increases.

Societal and occupational mobility, and present day unemployment, coupled with the demand for specific job skills, all present an awesome task to those seeking to prepare average youngsters to enter the job market. In addition to all of this faced by normal young people, many juvenile and youthful offenders have the additional problems of being deprived, neglected, unwanted, confused, turned off and turned out, long before they are seventeen years old. This makes the job of the correctional educator even more complex as well as vital.

Focusing our attention on only one part of the educational picture, vocational education, let me remind you briefly of some existing problems in this area coupled with a few suggestions to act as directional indicators. In varying degrees, many correctional institutions presently reflect inadequate student selection processes. Students are many times placed in a trade with insufficient consideration for proper assessment of their interests and abilities, or coordination of these interests and abilities in order to provide the individual with a direction in vocational development which gives promise of job interest as well as success. The direction that correctional education needs to take seems to be clearly indicated. Adequate assessment followed by individualized guidance on a periodic basis appears to be not only the wise course, but one which is mandatory, if young people are to be properly served.

Career education is another area which must be considered seriously. Such is either not provided or is provided haphazardly, improperly, or is insufficient to do what is necessary. How much attention is being given to the elements of career education which embodies career awareness, self-awareness, social awareness, decision making, economic awareness, educational awareness, work attitude and skill needs unique to a student's home community? The future should witness career education development in correctional schools in the form of a mini-course, a course of study, or a concept integrated into vocational and academic school subjects.

---

*Grady A. Decell is Director, South Carolina Department of Youth Services, Columbia, South Carolina.

Children below fourteen years of age committed to our institutions cannot be trained as tradesmen—this training will follow as they become older, more mature, and knowledgeable of their interests, strengths, and weaknesses. For these, career education along with training in life skills seems to be the appropriate direction. As students reach upper middle school or early high school, prevocational education along with career education and guidance will prepare them for intelligent vocational area selection later in life. In short, we must provide programs for the different age and maturity levels of students entrusted to our institutions.

Staff development programs are all too infrequent, inadequate, or non-existent. In-service programs lack technical instruction in the varied trades within many schools—in short, the in-service is too general. Many trade instructors are not trained adequately in relation to teacher education involving methods, teaching techniques, evaluation procedures, etc. Due to the twelve-month operation of institutions, little time, few provisions, and no money, make it very difficult for vocational instructors to up-grade their instructional skills and methods through school attendance. Even if the time and money were available, who would provide the technical isntruction in the varied fields needing coverage?

Coordinating such a project within one state would be quite difficult due to the small number of instructors available in any one vocational area. In addition, scheduling a suitable time and obtaining a sponsoring institute for instruction would make such even less cost effective. If correctional institutions within a state cannot cooperatively provide for this need, why cannot regional or national workshops be established to offer instruction in a few different trade areas each summer for a period of one to two weeks. This would perhaps allow a specific instructor to enhance his skill proficiency, course content, and teaching techniques every four to five years. Even though this may not be enough, it is more than is being done now in many states.

Periodic in-service or course study as mentioned may help eliminate other existing conditions in trade education—specifically—teaching in an "ole timey way" by the show-and-tell method, with instruction on what the institution needs repairing. Providing know-how in using different approaches, new materials, and up-to-date techniques in the field should help remove the lack of motivation found in many trade instructors. Some of the foregoing may be rather "institutional shaking" in that if such are used or strongly-considered, administrators who have been using vocational training primarily for the good of the institutional maintenance program will no doubt experience feelings of insecurity and monetary trauma.

Many students committed to our institutions are culturally and educationally deprived, non-motivated and/or lack innate ability to learn and perform as a technical and skilled tradesman. Many of those that can learn need more time to overcome the past as well as to be taught through the use of better techniques in order to absorb the technical knowledge found in many trades. What about those that do not have the ability to perform in a technical trade? I am suggesting that if we have not already done so, establish occupational training at a different level from that of the skilled technical worker. Providing training in such occupations as a filling station attendant, carpenter's helper, bricklayer's assistant, stock clerk, waiter/waitress, food service assistant, are only a few possibilities. For both the semi-skilled and the non-skilled student, courses such as Distributive Education or Diversified Occupations on a modified basis might be instituted for the older more trusted student who is within a couple of months of release, or who can only be released when adequate placement in a foster home becomes available.

In South Carolina, Distributive Education is designed to prepare students for employment in distribution and marketing of goods and services while Diversified Occupations is a cooperative arrangement with selected employers in trade and industrial occupations to enable secondary students to enter employment for training in specific occupations. Both of these courses are provided with classroom instruction, as well as teacher or course coordinator consultations and guidance. Certainly, not least among the problems that face us is providing students with survival or life skills as well as work skills and acceptable attitudes. By survival and life skills, I am referring to teaching students about how to look for employment, applying for a job, personal banking, establishing credit, spending money wisely, how to obtain legal aid, government services available, and other skills or knowledge that you and I take for granted.

All of these ideas mentioned, I feel, need our serious consideration. Whether any or all of these will benefit your facility, only you can answer. What will benefit us all is conducting an honest inventory of needs, defining school and vocational training objectives, establishing priorities, and enlisting support of all concerned.

VOCATIONAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

by
Trumbull W. Kelly
Mark Weideranders*

This paper will present some preliminary results of a California Youth Authority federally funded vocational education project on the assessment of needs among youthful offenders related to "job survival skills," and a brief discussion of the direction the California Youth Authority curriculum is going in the area of survival education.

The ultimate objective of the job survival skills project is to develop a modularized curriculum to teach job-seeking and job-keeping skills to those in Youth Authority detention, and hopefully, to impact on the currently high unemployment rate of those released to parole. Toward this end, the first phase of the project, involves the systematic assessment of deficiencies in these skill areas among wards on parole. The second phase will be the development and implementation of the curriculum, while the third phase will follow a cohort of those who have completed the curriculum to to measure their employment success against that of a control group. This report details the activities and results of research among parolees.

To gather data from the parolee sample, a structured interview technique was chosen so that subjects would be more able to supply detail about experiences than on a printed, objective scale of some kind.

A total of one hundred and forty-six wards on parole were interviewed, including thirty-one in Oakland, thirty-seven in San Jose, thirty-three in Stockton, and forty-four in San Diego. Subjects were selected according to certain demographic characteristics which would ensure that the sample was representative of CYA releases.

The ethnic composition of the sample roughly approximates the larger Youth Authority population: 39 percent black, 34 percent white, 23 percent Spanish surnamed, and 4 percent falling into other categories, compared with CYA-wide percentages for black, white, spanish surnamed, and others respectively. Males made up 93 percent of the sample and females, 7 percent, approximating the percentage rates among all CYA wards.

There were several topical areas within job survival which were considered important. These areas have to do with self-investigation and career planning, job-seeking (locating openings, application and interview techniques, etc.), job-keeping (interpersonal skills, accepting supervision, responsible assertion, effective work and time habits, etc.), job-mobility (moving to better jobs or advancing upward), training opportunities and resources, and some miscellaneous topics such as grooming and handling personal finances.

---

*Trumbull W. Kelly is Administrator for Education Services, California Youth Authority, Sacramento, California.

Mark Weideranders is Project Director, Job Survival Skills Project, California Youth Authority, Sacramento, California.

Ages ranged from sixteen to twenty-four (mean = 19.7, median = 20). During institutional confinement, 23 percent had been involved in a purely vocational training program, 34 percent had been in some combination of vocational and academic programs, while 37 percent had been in purely academic programs (the remainder had been in "other" programs, mainly medical/psychiatric treatment).

Subjects had been on parole for widely differing time periods (range: one to seventy-two months). Exactly half of the sample had been out for more than six months.

Virtually the entire sample had had a least brief first-hand esposure to the working world, and a large majority had worked since being released from Youth Authority facilities. By contrast, steady, long-term employment figures among those interviewed were dismal. Reasons for the poor survival rate, from the time that respondents had held their first job to the time they were interviewed, are complex and not always appropriately described in generalities.

Clearly, job retention is indicated as a tremendous problem in this study. Over 70 percent of the parolees had held at least one job during the first two months of parole, yet less than half of that percentage was still working at the end of that first two month period.

The employment picture emerging from these data is that of high unemployment and of poorly paid, presumably uninteresting, and short-lived jobs among those that have been employed.

Concerning job-seeking skills, it is clear that most parolees, shortly after institutional release, do find some type of job. Therefore, finding just "a job" is not a major problem for ex-offenders. However, finding the right job is still indicated as a problem, assuming that job attrition is in part due to quitting or being fired from an unhappy or inappropriate work situation.

The process of fitting aptitudes and interests with real jobs, or job-training plans, appears crucial to the job adjustment process. Present data show that knowing how to tap into and utilize available community resources for training and for job finding are areas in which Youth Authority parolees are very weak. Ideally, a process of systematic career planning should be begun before parole. Resources in each ward's community should be made known to him/her before or at least during the initial phases of parole, and parole services should be mobilized to assist and encourage persons to make use of these resources. Judging from the content of the interviews, continuous, systematic job planning and follow-through in the community does not happen with most Youth Authority wards.

Regarding the job application process itself, it is interesting that 22 percent of all respondents had not been required to fill out a formal application blank to obtain their last job. It became apparent during the interviews that many persons on parole arranged jobs very informally, and have often been hired on-the-spot, perhaps to begin work that day, by employers who didn't seem to care about past job history or training. Unfortunately, this might be a further reflection of the unskilled and dead-end nature of too many jobs secured by parolees.

When asked whether filling out job applications was difficult or was a stumbling block in getting jobs, only 17 percent mentioned having "some" problem, and only 8 percent described marked or severe difficulties. The fact that 75 percent reported no difficulty might reflect the simplicity of many of the forms required for the types of jobs parolees usually compete for or that respondents overestimated their job application abilities. If the self-reports in this instance are taken at face value, the degree of emphasis placed on job application training which is typically given in employment preparation classes is called into question.

Among those that did report problems with job applications, the most frequently mentioned type of problem was in reading or understanding the form. Convergent evidence to this point is that Spanish surnamed respondents (who were presumably more likely to have English-language difficulties than others) were more likely to have reported moderate or severe problems in filling out job applications than those of other ethnic groups.

When asked whether job interviews present problems or difficulties, about 29 percent said that "some" problems were encountered; none reported "severe" difficulties. The most common type of job interview problem was "being too nervous." There were no significant differences across ethnic or other groupings in the way these responses were distributed.

Finally, in speaking about the job acquisition process, there was much general pessimism about being able to get jobs that were really desired (as opposed to "just any job"). Almost half felt that it would be "extremely difficult" to get the type of job that was desired; another 36 percent felt that it would be "moderately difficult" to get a desired job.

In the job acquisition area, a simplified summary of findings would be that: (1) Most parolees learn of openings through family members and friends, and under-utilize other sources of information; (2) Problems in completing job applications are minimized as a problem by most parolees, although this might be due to overestimates of their actual skill-level and inexperience in competing for "good" jobs. Spanish surnamed parolees report more difficulties with job applications than members of other ethnic groups; (3) Of the 29 percent who reported job interview difficulties, most felt that nervousness was their main problem; (4) Tremendous pessimism exists toward getting desired jobs as opposed to available jobs.

During the interviews, information was solicited detailing reasons for job losses. Reasons were categorized according to such value judgements. Roughly 60 percent of respondents had lost at least one job at some time in the past, while 66 percent had voluntarily quit a job. Reasons behind losing jobs and quitting jobs were distributed as follows:

Reasons Behind Losing Jobs

	No.	Percent
Lay off, natural circumstances	28	33.3
Lay off, but suspected due to dissatisfaction with employee	12	14.3
Fired with stated reasons and in a deliberate manner	16	19.0
Fired on-the-spot (insubordination, incident, etc.)	16	19.0
Other	12	14.3
TOTAL	84	100.0

Two-thirds of those who lost jobs reported unhappy or "unnatural" circumstances surrounding the losses. Stories of dismissals ranged from vaguely worded messages from the boss ("We're going to have to let you go") to pointed incidents in which the supervisor and employee argued and fought (tending to terminate employment rather abruptly). One younger parolee had lost his first job the day before the interview after working for two days. He had dropped a large board on his toe, other workers had laughed, and the boy joined in the laughter even though his foot ached. The boss witnessed the incident and told the boy he was "through," that he "paid workers for doing jobs rather than for being clumsy clowns." Stories were sometimes even bizarre, such as losing a job as an animal feeder at the zoo because of an incident in which the employee was bit by a lion.

This data, as well as the qualitative stories, tend to confirm findings in other studies which reported that reasons for firings were typically due to factors other than lack of job-specific skills. In the present study, behavioral incidents, "personality conflicts" with the boss, poor habits in keeping work hours, etc., far outnumbered firings for specific inabilities to do the work. For example, a very common scenario involved the worker coming late to work a few times and then perhaps staying home from work once without calling the boss, resulting in being fired.

To tell or not to tell an employer about arrest records is an issue that divided respondents into groups that believed it the best policy to be completely open about their pasts (55 percent) vs. those who either gave qualified answers (10 percent) or those who would never tell about being arrested (35 percent). Job counselors, parole agents, and others who work with young offenders also gave differing opinions about the advantages of being open vs. stonewalling it. It could be that it really doesn't matter, overall, which policy is followed.

In the job keeping area, the most important single determining factor indicated by present results is co-worker relations. It appears that a particular mix of knowledge, attitude, and skill needs to be developed among many wards. In terms of knowledge, it appears important for potential workers to recognize that ignoring as well as aggressively overreacting to co-worker difficulties are poor strategies. Rather, the necessity of constructive and early confrontation with the co-worker is more likely to pay off.

The most common outside problems affecting work were hangovers, late-night parties, and girl/boy problems that affected getting to work the next day on time (or at all). The most common scenario found in responses was that a problem with a co-worker or boss caused irritability which in turn precipitated arguments with friends, or perhaps a drinking session.

In the area of personal responsibilities to self and others at work, questions were asked regarding safety rules and grooming. When asked to describe actual work situations in which safety rules had been ignored or in which the respondent had been reprimanded for not following safety rules, few subjects described having had significant difficulties. Over 85 percent (124 out of 145) reported being aware of the safety rules where they worked, and only 6 percent (8 subjects) made negative statements toward safety rules (the most common complaint was that some of the rules were "petty"). About 17 percent (20 persons) had run into problems because of safety rules, mostly involving minor reprimands for such infractions as not wearing safety goggles or other protective clothing in work areas. None reported having caused injuries on the job.

So although the importance of teaching and observing safety rules is obvious, it also appears that concerning job adjustment and retention, safety rules present fewer problems to parolees than some of the other survival skills discussed in this report.

The importance of good grooming is another item that is heavily emphasized in most job preparation courses or booklets. In the interviews, they found only 6 percent who were negative to stated or implied grooming rules. Another 21 percent were neutral in their attitudes toward such rules, and said that they would sacrifice such personal grooming preferences as long hair or facial hair, if they had to, to get a desired job. The balance of the sample (73 percent) were even more positive toward grooming practices necessary for work.

As in other job survival areas discussed, responses to these questions need to be understood in light of the type of jobs that most parolees held and from the point of view of the parolees themselves. In other words, employers looking for unskilled, lower paid, manual workers do not seem to care as much as employers looking for white collar or sales workers. Also, it is likely that respondents tended to underestimate the importance of appearances. It is possible that many of those who felt that grooming had never been a problem, had in fact been rejected by a prospective employer from further consideration because of poor or unconventional grooming, but simply were not given the specific reason for the rejection.

What implications does this rather dismal employment adjustment have for curriculum in our Youth Authority schools? Unless we can develop a really meaningful social education curriculum that will significantly change behavior and attitudes of our students, we can fairly accurately predict that our parolees will continue having a very sub-standard and marginal employment record.

In terms of improving vocational training programs, implications result from the data that increased emphasis in vocational classes must be placed on job survival skills, in addition to job specific skills.

Learning appropriate conflict resolution can then be taught as a skill, as the fields of assertiveness training and, more generally, social learning theory, have demonstrated. Unfortunately, traditional career awareness and job readiness curricula have not put as much emphasis on these areas as they have on the importance of learning how to complete job application forms. In the present project, a potentially limiting factor on eventual success is that few of the sets of educational materials reviewed in the process of compiling and developing a job survival training package go into the area of resolution of co-worker problems more than superficially. The need for further research and development activities on this topic is indicated.

On the other hand, many parolees are also losing jobs because of some rather straightforward violations of the work routine, such as tardiness, abusing sick-leave privileges, or skipping a day entirely. The importance of work routines can easily be stressed in the training program. Perhaps better still, institutional programming could be designed so that getting to "work" (class) on time, notifying the instructor if problems arise, and other personal habits become more the responsibility of individual wards than of living unit personnel, teachers, and peers. Many interview subjects reported that it was a shock, after long confinement and institutional structuring, to have to manage their own time again.

Finally, the need for community support and helpful intervention is indicated after institutional release. A critical period of adjustment seems to be during and perhaps after the first job while on parole. The vast majority of parolees get this job fairly soon, but most lose it quickly, and often do not return to readily to the job market. Inobtrusive but supportive counseling during this period could help to ease the transition to being a working person, and perhaps to cushion the blow of an initial failure. Development of a coordinated, systematic effort to provide these services, perhaps by Youth Authority parole, is another area that is not included in the present project design, but might have high payoff in a future project.

VOCATIONAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

by Christ L. George*

I. History and Background of the Ohio Youth Commission

The Ohio Legislature recognized the special needs of youthful offenders and in 1963 by legislative act created the Ohio Youth Commission. This was indeed a milestone for the State of Ohio because up to this time youthful offenders were not represented by any cabinet officer and they were programmed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Corrections. The Ohio Youth Commission is composed of a Director and two Deputy Directors. Currently under the present administration Mr. William Willis is the Director, Mr. M. B. McLane is the Deputy Director of Correctional Services and Dr. Joseph Palmer is Deputy Director of Community Services. The Director of the Ohio Youth Commission by serving on the Governor's Cabinet can receive the attention of the Governor on critical youthful offender needs.

In Ohio there are ten institutions for youthful offenders, ages twelve to eighteen. These are listed as follows:

1. Maumee Youth Camp – Liberty Center, Ohio – twelve to fourteen aged males.
2. Mohican Youth Camp – Loudonville, Ohio – fourteen to sixteen aged males.
3. Cuyahoga Hills Boys School – Warrensville Heights, Ohio – fourteen to sixteen aged males.
4. Buckeye Youth Center – Columbus, Ohio – fourteen to seventeen aged males.
5. Training Center for Youth – Columbus, Ohio – thirteen to eighteen aged males.
6. Scioto Village – Powell, Ohio – twelve to eighteen aged females.
7. Riverview School for Girls – Powell, Ohio – fourteen to eighteen aged females.
8. Fairfield School for Boys – Lancaster, Ohio – sixteen to eighteen aged males.
9. Indian River School – Massilon, Ohio – sixteen to eighteen aged males.
10. Training Institute of Central Ohio – Columbus, Ohio – sixteen to eighteen aged males.

Of these ten institutions only four have vocational programs in Trades and Industries approved by the Ohio State Department of Vocational Education. These four institutions with vocational programs are Scioto Village, Fairfield School for Boys, Indian River School and Training Institute of Central Ohio.

II. Vocational Education Programs in the Ohio Youth Commission

It is written in the Goals of the Ohio Youth Commission that each youth committed would be assigned the least restrictive alternative and would receive a treatment program meeting his or her needs for rehabilitation. The administration emphatically supports the view that education is part of the treatment process. This philosophy is evident because of the insistence that all educational programs, academic and vocational be of high calibre, fully accredited and available to any youth desirous of them. The Ohio Youth Commission has established yearly inspections with the Ohio Department of Education of all vocational and academic programs.

---

*Christ L. George is Superintendent of Education, Ohio Youth Commission, Columbus, Ohio.

The Training Institute of Central Ohio (TICO) is one of the maximum security institutions of the Ohio Youth Commission. The school has a 200 bed capacity and it offers the youth academic and vocational programming. The vocational programs offered at TICO are auto mechanics, welding, food service, printing, and small engine repair. The programs at TICO are designed for morning and afternoon sessions in the manipulative areas. The students assigned to the morning sessions in the vocational areas then are assigned to the academic areas in the afternoon. Students at TICO have an average length of stay of twelve months.

Scioto Village is an open type institution for girls. It serves the intermediate offender and the girls here have an average length of stay of five months. This school has academic and vocational programs. The vocational programs are food service, needle trades, cosmetology, and motel-housekeeping. Two programs not currently being operated are fabric services and baking.

Indian River School is a maximum security institution for males sixteen to eighteen years of age. This institution is the newest of the Ohio Youth Commission institutions. It was opened in 1974 and offers academic and vocational programming for the youth. The vocational programs are welding, auto mechanics, auto body, building maintenance and drafting. Currently air conditioning and heating program is in need of a teacher and is inoperable. The average length of stay for youth is twelve months.

Fairfield School for Boys is an open type institution and the average length of stay is five months. This institution has an academic and a vocational education program. The following vocational programs are offered at Fairfield: auto mechanics, carpentry, masonry, barbering, electronics, machine trades, welding, appliance repair, printing, shoe repairing, building maintenance, plumbing, painting, house wiring, custodial, and the car care service station emphasizing wheel alignment and auto tune up.

When the populations of the four institutions providing vocational programs increased it was necessary to provide for the manipulative training on a half time morning or afternoon basis. This allowed more youth to be programmed into vocational training and eliminated waiting lists. Any student desirous of entering vocational training was programmed and the other half of the day was enrolled in the academic subjects to complete his minimal requirements for high school graduation. Vocational programs in the State of Ohio, by being accredited in the institutions, allow youth the opportunity to graduate and to earn high school credits, which are transferrable in the public school of the youth upon their release.

III. Interests and Needs of Juvenile Offenders

It has been determined over a thirteen-year period in the State of Ohio that incarcerated juvenile offenders are verbalizing certain likes and dislikes. From these verbalizations some generalizations of program needs for youthful offenders can be listed. These are as follows:

1. Youth want academic and vocational programs which do not hinder or retard their progress toward a high school diploma.

2. Youth want programs which may be offered in their own vocational schools in their own communities, in case they want further training.

3. Youth want programs which train them for some type of employment.

4. Youth want programs which eliminate failure and allow them the opportunity to progress at their own speed and at their own level of course completion and proficiency.

5. Youth want program completion or competency recognition with certificates indicating these proficiencies.

The vocational programs of the Ohio Youth Commission are organized around the open entry open exit concept and many of the above listed concerns of youthful offenders are taken into consideration in the operational directives of the vocational programs. Many of the youthful offenders taking vocational programs today are under the age of eighteen. If they are released prior to their eighteenth birthday they will have difficulty entering a trade or an apprenticeship program excluding youth under the age of eighteen. In fact many employers will not hire youth for jobs in certain trades and restricted occupations under the age of eighteen.

We have to revise our objectives and teaching strategies for our vocational programs and assess the teaching of the concentrated vocational skill versus the teaching of job attitudes, job readiness, work habits, career orientation, and only minimal skill proficiency.

We have established vocational advisory groups from the communities to assist our institutions in formulating relevant vocational programs. These advisory groups are consultative in nature and they bring to the vocational teachers the latest technological methods being utilized in the trades they represent. The advisory groups are unanimous in their suggestion concerning the teaching of positive work habits and job attitudes and indicate that they want to do the concentrated skill training on the job. This reinforces the concept that with the shortened length of stay in the institutions our teaching goals and objectives must change.

IV. Problems for Vocational Programs Today

Correctional educators must address themselves to the problems for the implementation of relevant vocational programs. First, the job market is limited today for youthful offenders. With high unemployment and with traditional vocational correctional programs the released youthful offender may have been trained for unemployment rather than employment. Secondly, the unions or community employers are not permitted by legislation to hire youthful offenders under the age of eighteen in many occupations. Third, if the youthful offender is desirous of continuing the correctional vocational program upon his release, the public school must be able to reprogram the youth upon his return to the community. Fourth, if it is at all possible, communities and the judicial system should work toward allowing youth to remain in their own communities in the rehabilitation process. These problems must be solved if the needs of youthful offenders are to be met with relevant vocational programs. If money spent in corrections would have to be prioritized it would be much wiser to allocate much more to salvage the youthful offender rather than the adult offender.

V. Recommendations and Summary

In summary many youth under the age of eighteen have entered a life of crime and it is very important to accept the philosophy that youth may change their attitudes. Many times, the process of maturity and development allows a youth to change in spite of teachers and programs. Educators in correctional institutions must make every effort to initiate programs that bring about changes in the youth and upgrade their value systems. Vocational education programs are excellent vehicles for improving self concept, eliminating the failure image, providing hands-on experiential activities and training youth for future wage earning roles. It is very important that the vocational programs should be established on projections from labor surveys indicating needs in certain occupations. The Department of Education of each state should create a cooperative effort in the training of vocational education teachers. This currently is implemented in the State of Ohio with the Ohio Youth Commission benefitting from a teacher educator and a vocational consultant from the Department of Education.

The vocational programs of correctional institutions should be accredited by the State Department of Education in order for the youth to receive credits which are acceptable and transferrable to other public schools and to be counted toward high school graduation requirements. The programs in the institutions should allow for any youth to be assigned to vocational programs based on reliable diagnostic and other data. Every youth should be able to benefit from vocational program experiences. Finally, the selection of healthy, empathetic, well informed and student oriented teachers should be the top priority of correctional administrators. These teachers should have the opportunity to upgrade their skills through in-service programs.

OFFENDER NEEDS IN SHORT-TERM INSTITUTIONS: NYC DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

by Alphonso K. Ford*

The attempt to identify and impact upon the needs of offenders remanded to correction institutions has been, and probably will continue to be, an ever pressing need. The New York City Department of Correction has been able to utilize resources in the educational community consisting of community colleges, senior colleges, and schools of social work. It has been a working partnership to involve the larger community which in the final analysis has a vested interest in the resocialization of the offender.

Prior to discussing offender needs, a brief background of the Department will be in order. The New York City Department of Correction administers what is probably the largest pre-trial detention system in the country. Additionally, the department operates facilities for sentenced inmates serving terms of one (1) year or less. On any given day, some 7,000 persons are under its care and custody. What is unique about the system is that there are two (2) distinct populations: one, detention (61 percent) and two, sentenced (39 percent).

Historically and prior to 1967, the New York City Department of Correction administered a system designed to address the needs of sentenced prisoners serving terms up to three (3) years. Through utilization of an effective classification system, inmate needs and skills were identified in order to make proper assignments to educational, vocational, treatment and work programs. In September of 1967, following New York State legislative action, persons serving sentences of one (1) year or more were remanded to facilities administered by the New York State Division of Correctional Services. Those persons serving one (1) year or less remained the responsibility of the New York City Department of Correction. In the city system, that period from 1967 through 1970 was characterized by a yearly increase of inmates in population, reaching the pinnacle in 1970. A review of population reveals the following average daily inmate census.[1]

YEAR	DETAINEES	SENTENCED	TOTAL POPULATION
1967	4,746	4,788	9,534
1968	6,057	4,916	10,973
1969	7,749	5,421	13,170
1970	7,667	6,098	13,765

---

*Alphonso K. Ford is Assistant Commissioner of the New York City Department of Corrections.

[1] New York City Department of Correction Statistical Report—1976.

In 1970 the New York City Department of Correction experienced one of the most severe eruptions in its history when rioting occurred within days of each other in four (4) of its detention institutions. Following extensive investigations and studies, it was determined that overcrowding in the jails resulting from court delays in disposing of cases was a major contributing factor to the riot, or rebellions as viewed by segments of the community. In response to recommendations submitted by investigatory groups, a number of bail review and alternative to incarceration programs were initiated.

As a result of this intervention of bail and/or alternative programs to incarceration, the department has tended to "inherit" the type of detainee who is considered "the least desirable" candidate for diversion programs. The diversion programs have rejected him because he or she:

1. is charged with a serious offense, and likely to get "heavy" time.
2. has a prior history of bail jumping and/or performed unsatisfactorily while previously under probation or parole supervision.
3. has an extensive and serious prior arrest history.
4. has no "stable" ties in the community.
5. has a severely limited educational background which limits admission to training programs.
6. has demonstrated no real "motivation" and interest in rejecting past methods of "getting over."

In short, most of the men and women in our city institutions appear to "qualify" for lock-up.

Even with available diversion programs, in 1976 the New York City Department of Correction received 50,799 males and 5,584 females for a total of 56,383 admissions. The inmate population is predominantly Black (56 percent) and Hispanic (25 percent). The remaining groups are 14 percent White and 5 percent other which includes Orientals, Haitians, Dominicans. In 1976 the average length of stay for detention males, both adolescent and adult, was forty-four (44) days. For sentenced males, adolescent and adult, the average length of stay was ninety (90) days.

Given the relative short stay of men and women in New York City Department of Correction facilities, a realistic approach had to be made to the problem of meeting the needs of the short-term offender, be they educational, vocational, psychological or other. Given our limited personnel and financial resources, there was, and still is, question as to can we provide more than just care, control and custody. Should we provide more and if so how? The New York City Department of Correction under the direction and philosophy of its Commissioner, Benjamin J. Malcolm has been committed to providing the best possible care while also making available when possible, those programs and services that enable inmates to explore positive alternative modes of adapting. Given the large turnover of inmates in our system in any month, the department is potentially the largest social service intake bureau in the country with the exception of the New York City Department of Social Services. In one sense, an emerging role of the department has in a large part been that of a diagnostic and referral agent to:

1. Educational, vocational, and social agencies in the community that can, and should, intervene in a planning role early in the detainee's stay in the institution.

2. Identify needs and prescribe areas of program intervention by the department while the inmate is in custody.

3. Direct material to classification boards of the New York State Department of Correctional Services to assist in future planning for that detainee who becomes sentenced to a term of more than one (1) year.

Upon reviewing and evaluating the educational needs of inmates it was found that a number were functional illiterates, requiring English as a second language skill as well as basic remediation. It was critical to upgrade the skills of this target group since many were unable to complete job applications, let alone meet entrance requirements for vocational training programs. The department developed a reading center program to assist those inmates who were reading below a sixth grade level. Each center was staffed with a reading coordinator and inmate tutors who were selected based upon their skills and interest.

This program was funded through L.E.A.A. monies as a demonstration project. The center's objectives are fivefold: (1) To teach illiterate adult and adolescent inmates in three New York City Correction institutions to read and write; (2) To raise levels of reading competency in those institutions of functionally illiterate inmates who read below the middle of the fifth grade; (3) To promote inmate positive contacts with the "outside" through the use of community volunteers as tutors; (4) To promote an awareness of peer group problems and the possibility of helping someone in need through the use of literate inmates as reading tutors; and (5) To develop a model reading program that can be delivered as a package to other correction institutions with similar populations and problems.

The three institutions on the island chosen for implementation of this program are the New York House of Detention for Men (HDM), the Adolescent Detention Center (C-71), and the Adolescent Reception and Detention Center (C-74).

The experience of the Adult Reading Center during the year from Septgember 1972 to September 1973 had led to three important realizations. First, approximately 60 percent of the inmate population was reading at a level of low sixth grade or less. Second, these inmates can be taught reading competency through the use of individualized instruction stressing self-direction and motivation. Third, many inmates evidenced a strong desire to enter the program, which was a voluntary one.

Based on these empirical observations, the AARC is set up to provide each learner with a detailed diagnosis of reading needs and an individually prescribed program of instruction which is self-directing, self-pacing, and self-evaluating. The basic vehicle for accomplishing these criteria is the High Intensity Learning System (HILS), published by Random House.

We found this type of program to be highly effective and requested New York City Community and La Guardia Community Colleges to run similar programs for our inmates in two other institutions. An unexpected dividend of engaging the colleges in these activities, resulted in their developing high school equivalency programs for those men who successfully upgraded their skills.

The New York City Community College cooperated with the New York City Department of Correction by developing a vocational certificate program for inmates and ex-offenders. A number of inmates were admitted to their Voorhees Vocational Certificate Program upon discharge from departmental institutions. Because of the preparatory work initiated while inmates were in custody, they were motivated to continue. Vocational programs are in welding, machine-tool, radio and color T.V. repair.

Another vocationally focussed activity sponsored by New York City Community College is the Institutional Food Service Training Program. Funds for this program were granted by the New York State Education Department through the Vocational Education Act. Its goal is to provide detainees at the Brooklyn House of Detention with basic theoretical and practical knowledge in the Food Service field. One hundred and fifty (150) hours of classroom training and cooking experience was designed to enable program graduates to secure employment at or above entry level upon release.[2] Classroom work included Business Math, Food Standards, Purchasing, Food Sanitation and a practicum in Short Order Cookery. There were seventy-nine (79) men in the program and of this number, fifty one (51) completed the program and were transferred "upstate" upon conviction. There is a need to establish a follow-up process to determine if the men's initial experiences were built upon in the state system. During the present program year, New York City Community College developed a community based program so that the enrolees could continue their training upon release.

Another model program that has shown positive impact upon the needs of the short-term offender is the College Adapter Program of the Higher Education Development fund in New York City. It has long been recognized that the ex-offender must develop basic educational skills if he or she is to make significant use of training opportunities. Without the ex-offender possessing basic saleable skills that can be utilized in the community, it is very likely that recidivism will occur. The department, working closely with the Higher Education fund, identified the educational gaps that were predominate in the inmate population. In 1974 the fund initiated the College Adapter Program to service the recently released ex-offender. This open intake unit received referrals from the department as well as parole and probation. In its first year this unit provided over 120 ex-offenders with G.E.D. and pre-college training and with individual and group counseling. Based upon this experience, in 1975 the College Adapter Prison Project was introduced. It is a comprehensive educational program operating in the New York City House of Detention for Men on Rikers Island. The program trains pre-trial detainees in both a standard and bilingual curriculum for the G.E.D. Since 1975, the program has serviced over 500 men and was recently extended to the Bronx House of Detention for Men.

The Department's Office of Program Services has worked very closely with College Adapter in constructing a model of continuous educational input throughout the individual's involvement in the Criminal Justice System. A number of men have been "tracked" upon their entrance into the program at New York City facilities, their transfer to the upstate prison system and back into the community. Educational and vocational summaries regarding the enrolee are prepared by the program and forwarded to the New York State Department of Correctional Services for use in classification. In all cases, College Adapter has made written recommendations as to further educational needs. In many instances, the recommendations of the program have been followed. Reports on tests administered are available to the State System upon request. Upon parole, most men previously enrolled, continue their training and educational relationship with the College Adapter Program as a part of parole and discharge planning.

In a statement related to the needs of offenders, the College Adapter Program noted:

> Studies of the literature at the local and national levels and the experience of HEDF in planning and operating programs for ex-offenders, ex-addicts and detainees have indicated a general educational profile of this population which includes: inordinately

---

[2] Annual Report 1975-76 Division of Continuing Education – New York City Community College.

> high drop-out rates in schools, low skill deficiencies in all academic areas, poor job skills related to inadequate education, lack of career education or guidance and limited previous work experience. All this, in conjunction with the lack of the necessary educational credentials such as a high school diploma, makes access to higher education and employment dependent upon sound manpower education. The needs for adult education models is evidenced by the following statistics: 60 percent of the ex-offenders and ex-addicts and 65 percent of detainees tested by HEDF staff score within the basic education range; nationally, 61 percent of all inmates have not completed high school while the illiteracy rate is 45 percent; bilingual education services were required by 30 percent of detainees tested by HEDF at Rikers Island yet such services are not consistently provided by treatment and correctional facilities with a similar percentage of bilingual clients. Demonstration investments in projects to serve these specialized needs are necessary to develop the educational problem solving and decision-making skills which are basic requirements for gaining and maintaining access to higher education and employment.[3]

This statement has profoundly identified key problem areas that must be addressed if we are to seriously impact upon the vocational needs of inmates.

The New York Junior League of New York City has had a unique role in developing a special program addressing the needs of the woman offender. For one year, the League through its "Job Placement for Women Ex-Offenders Committee" assisted women in the Development Unit to find employment. The Development Unit was established in 1973 as a special housing unit to assist women in planning for discharge who had come to recognize their need for help in exploring alternate avenues for successful adjustment in the community. It wasn't long before the league found that a number of women needed better preparation in order to be placed on jobs. The department assisted the New York Junior League in obtaining funding through the Addiction Services Agency of New York City. The venture was called "Skills Training for Ex-Offenders Program" (STEP).

STEP provided clerical skills training in fourteen (14) week cycles to sentenced women. Pre-trial detainee women were also accepted who were being held on charges that generally took three (3) months or more to be resolved. Training was in the areas of typing, filing, basic and business English. Job development was ongoing and placement services provided at time of release.[4] The New York Junior League subcontracted to the Katherine Gibbs School, to provide the actual curriculum and training staff. The program was conducted at the New York City Correctional Institution on Rikers Island with graduation exercises of enrolees as an integral part of the program. For greater details regarding placement of women, inquiries can be addressed to the New York Junior League, 130 East 80th Street, New York, New York 10021. Demonstration funding has ended and the Junior League and the department are presently seeking new funding for the program.

While there are ongoing educational and vocational programs in the department funded by tax monies, they are not under the direct supervision of the department. The Board of Education of New York City has the responsibility of providing these services and is not accountable to the Department of Correction. While the Board of Education directs programs, it has not shown flexibility to address the special educational needs of offenders due to severe cuts in its budget. Also there are no evening vocational programs operated by the Board of Education in the community to which the offender can be referred. All of the previous programs described are made available by community resources and dependent upon year to year funding. By the very nature of funding, these programs are at best transient. It points up the need to have programs underwritten by city tax dollars be under the control and direction of the department if we are to make a sustained effort to provide vocational and educational help to short-term offenders.

---

[3] "Comprehensive Educational Service Analysis," College Adapter Prison Project, January 1976, 2090 Adam Clayton Powell Jr. Blvd., New York, New York 10027.

[4] "Planning and Development of Vocational Services for Women Offenders," Addiction Services Agency, September 1976.

Correctional systems will also have to use community work release more judisciously so that inmates can take advantage of educational and vocational training programs. The time spent in halfway houses may be the only opportunity ex-offenders have to pursue and develop socially accepted skills without "distracting" concerns of paying for housing and food. We have to re-think how we can help the ex-offender in training programs stay in those programs until completion without wondering how he will eat and pay his rent. This major problem on non-planning of basic "life-supports" to the ex-offender in training has assured that most men and women will fail in efforts to become resocialized.

To me, it is very clear that the time is long overdue that correctional, educational, business, and social service systems collaborate in the joint planning and administering of programs that realistically impact upon vocational/educational needs of ex-offenders.

OFFENDER NEEDS IN SHORT-TERM INSTITUTIONS

by Ernestine H. Schnuelle*

Correctional education programs, academic and vocational, have been a long-time coming for the short-term sentenced or unsentenced incarcerated person. Successes, however small, are important and have and will foster additional acceptance and credibility as well as financial support. Skill, tact, patience, and individualization are the vital keys to developing programs for these disadvantaged students.

A major consideration in planning educational offerings for the inmates of city and county facilities is making the instruction meet the personal needs of each student. Everyone realizes that people are not born equal nor do they mature equally. Thus it is senseless to try to keep them together educationally. The successful educational program works with these differences by taking the student whenever he comes and at whatever level he performs. The concept of open entry and open exit for adult education, especially in the correctional setting, is absolutely essential. The inmate must become involved in training that is individualized to meet his needs the day he chooses to join a class. His interests, skills, and past training or employment should be assessed so he can be properly placed at a level which will provide him optimum opportunity for success. The best way to ascertain vocational interest and potential skills is through the work evaluation process, which explores vocational interests and ascertains physical and mental capabilities of individuals by utilizing various work sample tasks that are set up in a "realistic" work environment.

The individual entering this program is looked at in the light of someone entering the labor force. In this regard, such things as ability to perform job tasks, work tolerance (i.e., tolerance to physical and mental demands of the job; tolerance to routine repetitive work; etc.) and work habits (i.e., job responsibility; worker cooperation; attention span; etc.) are put in focus.

While commercial units are on the market, they are costly. If money is not available, work samples or units can be inexpensively created by the evaluator or teacher to perform the task.

When such centers are not available, psychometric testing such as the GATB and interest/aptitude tests such as the Strong Vocational Interest Blank or the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory should be given in conjunction with such academic tests as the Gates-MacGinitie, the Nelson-Denny or the Peabody Picture Vocabulary to establish a combined function level. With this information the teacher or counselor can place the student in an individualized program commensurate with his skills and background.

Many commercial materials utilizing the individualized approach to learning are on the market. While these are an essential part of the open entry concept of learning, there is also an additional need for personalized instruction. A teacher must create or seek out materials to meet the personal deficiencies and modes of learning of a student.

---

*Ernestine H. Schnuelle is Administrator of Correctional Education, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Los Angeles, California.

Successful vocational training must be closely correlated with academic instruction related to the field. Understanding basic vocational vocabulary is essential to the success of the student. Besides individualized units covering specific terms of a given field, similar materials in diagram and chart reading as well as basic math are logical and necessary academic counterparts to effective vocational training.

Because many employers require a high school diploma, a complete training program must provide the opportunity for obtaining it or an equivalency. Because of the short-term of sentences and due to national recognition of a GED test, the establishment of a testing site within the facility most realistically meets this educational need. However, it should in no way prohibit the possibility of the student obtaining a high school diploma. Careful counseling is required to help adults to distinguish the value of each.

While a variety of vocational training opportunities may seem ideal, the establishment of several sound programs is more realisitc in the typical jail. A wise consideration in developing vocational programs is to provide learning opportunities as equally as possible for the unsentenced and the sentenced. Because of custody regulations, transitory classes may need to be created to serve the pre-trial detainees who, when sentenced, would be registered in the regular vocational class. The transitory class for the unsentenced should include at least a career information system even if there is no time for actual training.

Even if nothing else is offered vocationally, any educational program can offer instruction on seeking and maintaining employment. Students should be assisted in how to complete applications and be comfortable in a job interview. Video tapes of actual or simulated interviews generally create interest. Discussions of the importance of employer employee relations and constructive methods of handling disagreements which might arise after employment are essential. The student must be instructed of the necessity for meeting the responsibilities of the job to gain success and advancement. This course fits well into the time line of the student incarcerated for a short-term and can be an integral part of a transitory course for the unsentenced.

The individualization and the personal approach to training takes teacher time even with the utilization of the many excellent modular materials available. The one to one relationship in teaching which is necessary to the program is possible through the use of paraprofessionals, work study interns, and trained tutors. In all cases, paid or volunteer, training in tutorial methods and in the use and creation of individual units for special situations is needed prior to working with the student. In addition, volunteers should make a specific commitment of time to provide the stability necessary for a functional program.

Structure within educational programs for inmates is paramount. Because the student may enter the class and leave it at any time, organization of the content is essential. The recording in the student's school folder of work accomplished should be equally structured. A strict procedure of maintaining sutdent records should be established and followed. Accountability is especially essential to correctional education programs. Structure in class offerings, curriculum development and support services provide the tools for such accountability.

Providing academically and vocationally coordinated programs through an open entry/exit format, supported by the use of paraprofessionals, is the major key to learning success for the short-term incarcerated inmate. However, other planning precautions are germane.

The concept of the third party providing educational services is important. Generally the "outsider" can more easily reach a constructive relationship with the inmate student than a member of the custody staff can achieve. Credibility for the program with both the student and the Sheriff's staff is more easily obtained when centrally administered and taught by trained professionals and assistants.

A smooth working relationship with the personnel of the facility is important and can be gained through hard work, patience and planning. Basic to this is the recognition of the existence of two varying disciplines; the educational and the custodial. Each must understand the other's viewpoint. This takes planning which involves ongoing in-service for the personnel of the department as well as for the educational staff. The teacher has an additional responsibility in that he must walk the middle ground and gain and maintain the respect of both the inmate and the Sheriff's personnel to be able to be an effective educator in a correctional setting.

Another priority in planning is financial. Sufficient funding to provide an ongoing program rather than a "one shot" approach should be available. While perhaps "something is better than nothing," adequate planning in this area can assure a better program with more lasting results. Financial support varies greatly within each state, and the appropriate funding source becomes an individual determination. Some programs are financed totally by the Sheriff's Department and some are funded in conjunction with adult schools or colleges.

Provision of adequate counseling services is another essential to effective planning. Crisis counseling is always needed and is basic to the other services of a counseling program. Until the inmate student begins to have "his head on straight," he will have difficulty in making valid educational and vocational choices. Obviously, academic and career guidance must be an integral part of the educational program. Veterans' counseling, college counseling, and assistance with financial aide programs are important components of the support services. In addition, job placement and follow-up are essential to the vocational training program.

Planning for vocational courses must also include a realistic goal of training for a job market which has employment opportunities. Careful coordination with the state employment service will more likely make the vocational offerings within an institution a positive experience. Success for the released inmate to become productive in society rather than to have another disappointment by having been guided into training in which there was no hope for monetary or personal realization of success is essential.

The security regulations of a facility must be a part of the overall planning for classes. These rules differ for various inmates and situations.

Another obvious consideration in planning is available space. As programs are successful and prove worthwhile to the functioning of the department, space sometimes becomes allocated to educational programs rather than for its original use.

Planning must include the development of course content so that state and local requirements for course approval, course credit, funding, and veterans' approval are met.

In addition, careful selection of soft and hard ware needs are to be made. If written materials, film strips, cassetts, etc. are used as media for teaching, the content must be adult oriented but carefully presented in a vocabulary which is comprehensible by the student. Various levels of materials on the same subject may need to be provided. Initial planning should include opportunities for teachers, counselors and the administrator to attend conferences where materials for adults are shown as well as seeking out and visiting ongoing, effective programs throughout the state and nation.

Providing recognition for the success the student receives while in school is another aspect of planning programs. This might be in the form of a high school diploma, a certificate of achievement or completion, a letter of recommendation or a graduation exercise. Whatever the form, the recognition must be in the name of the school providing the training and not in the name of the correctional institution where it was located.

Serving the academic and vocational needs of the wide variety of short-term, disadvantaged students is not an easy task, but it is possible and can more than pay for itself. While this presentation deals exclusively with the development of training programs for both sentenced and unsentenced men and women within the Sheriff's custody facilities of a large metropolitan area, the underlying planning concepts could be meaningful in most situations throughout the country.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NEEDS OF OFFENDERS IN SHORT-TERM INSTITUTIONS

by Bill Broome*

Introduction

Before assessing the needs of offenders in any corrections institution, it is important to first analyze the characteristics of offenders incarcerated in the facility. The characteristics and needs of offenders, weighed in light of their average length of residency, should signal the types of programs and services offered to them during their confinement.

But a more scientific analysis must preface program planning and implementation. Among the more critical questions to be addressed and resolved are: What is the probable immediate destiny of the majority of offenders held in the short-term institution? Will they be released from custody, or will they be transferred to a prison? Candidly, it appears pointless for a short-term institution to impart vocational skills to an offender destined for long-term residency in a prison! About the most that can or should be done for such offenders is to orient them with the array of vocational programs offered at the prison in which they will be confined.

If a significant number of offenders will be released from custody, then a critical question to be answered is: What and where is their job market? To train offenders for jobs for which there is no demand, or which may not be readily available to them because of their criminal records, is a monumental disservice to the offenders and a frivilous waste of money and effort.

Important, too, is a consideration of the offenders average length of stay in the short-term institution. Will he be there long enough to teach him a marketable job skill? Or, more specifically: How much of a particular vocational skill can be imparted to the offender during his period of confinement? It may prove more practical to conduct only an occupational orientation program—pitched to the vocational training programs that are offered in the community to which the offender will return. Or it may be more prudent to offer quick skills training such as "How to be a Good Waiter or Waitress."

Equally germane in the planning of programs and services to meet offender needs is a thorough evaluation of the short-term institution. How disparate is its offender population? What is its size and location? What space is available for programs? What is its staffing ratio to offenders, and what is the guard prototype? What commitment does the administration have to education programs for offenders?

These comments and questions are posed primarily to emphasize that, in my opinion, any vocational education program for offenders must be tailor-made for a specific short-term institution if it is to be realistic and meaningful! There is no standard vocational education program that is readily adaptable to all short-term institutions.

---

*Bill Broome is Director, Research and Development, Harris County Sheriff's Department, Houston, Texas.

Offender Characteristics

It was suggested initially that offender needs should be predicated on their characteristics. To cite a county jail as the example of a short-term institution, several surveys have been conducted which reflect some surprisingly consistent data pertaining to offenders in jails across the country.

These studies reflect the following general offender characteristics:

- 95 percent of offenders in jails are male;
- 56 percent are white, 42 percent are black, and 2 percent are other races;
- 48 percent are single, 24 percent are married, 18 percent are separated or divorced, and 10 percent were engaged in common-law relationships at the time of their arrest;
- The most frequent age range is twenty-one to twenty-four;
- 66 percent have at most some secondary school education, between grades nine and eleven;
- About 60 percent have had no vocational or technical training;
- 60 percent were employed at the time of their arrest for current charges, but about half of this number had held their jobs for less than six months at the time of arrest;
- 70 percent reported that they had been arrested at least once during the past five years prior to their arrest for current charges;
- The most frequent offenses for which they are incarcerated are:
  a. Burglary,
  b. Narcotic Drug Law Violations,
  c. Robbery,
  d. Auto Theft;
- The average length of stay in jail awaiting trial is three months.

In a 1975 survey of offenders in Harris County (Texas) Jails conducted by the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, virtually identical offender characteristics were reported. However, the average length of stay in a pre-trial status jumped to six months. Offenders who placed their sentence on appeal had an average jail residency of twenty months.

Upon examination of these general offender characteristics, we can create a prototype of the offender whose vocational education needs should come into sharper focus.

Typically, the offender in jail is a twenty-three-year-old, single, white male; a school dropout with an erratic job history, who has had prior direct contact with the criminal justice system. In all probability, he will spend his next five years in prison.

While the offender surveys do not summarize it, those of us who have studied criminology and are experienced in corrections can also attest to several other characteristics commonly found in offenders. They usually have long histories of anti-social behavior; they are inherently sly and manipulative; they are most often from broken homes. They harbor the "born to lose" image, and the genuine feeling that nobody "gives a damn" about them.

Their needs, then, become fairly obvious:

- They need to be motivated to pursue self-improvement;
- They need to be made aware of the educational opportunities available to them;
- They need testing, counseling and guidance which will "point" them toward an occupation that is most compatible with their abilities, aptitudes and interests;
- They need to be indoctrinated with job-finding skills and good work habits;
- They need to be kept "productively occupied" while in confinement, under the immediate supervision of an instructor or guard who manifests a sincere and legitimate interest in their progress toward self-improvement;
- They need to learn a job skill during confinement which will qualify them for immediate employment upon release from confinement; and
- When released from custody, they may need assistance in obtaining employment, and perhaps a place to live.

Thus, these offenders are our challenge–our clients whose vocational education needs must be addressed and abated. We must do whatever we can to insure that their institutional experience does not make them more vindictive toward society than they were prior to incarceration. We must qualify them, to the extent of our abilities, to lead a productive and respectful life after their release from confinement.

So, to properly chart their course and our strategy, we must next carefully and candidly examine the setting in which they are confined–the short-term institution. Vocational education or quick skills programs cannot be implemented in the absence of necessary physical space; they cannot be conducted appropriately without the cooperation of custodial staff; they are doomed to eventual failure without the vibrant support of the institution's top administration!

The Short-Term Institution

Jails are, primarily, a temporary holding facility with a highly transient population. As the crime rate soars, so does their population. Currently, throughout the country, the population of jails is disproportionate to their physical capacity. Jails are, simply stated, grossly overcrowded.

Typical jail populations are comprised of anything but homogeneous elements and, because of this varied structure and composition, it becomes necessary to define at least the major types of inmates housed in jails.

Usually, the jail population is predominantly weighted toward those people awaiting trial–men and women who are preoccupied with the court's determination of their "guilt" or "innocence."

But even though the greatest numbers fall under this category, there are actually two distinct types of pre-trial detainees.

First, we find that the majority of pre-trial detainees are repeaters. They've been here before–some many times. Perhaps they are institutionalized, perhaps not, but they think at least that they "know the ropes."

Experts at the games played in jail, they know how to maneuver and manipulate, and usually pride themselves in their "jailhouse status" as "characters." Ties to the outside world are either very loose or non-existent, thereby fostering an attitude of bitterness toward, and isolation from, the free world. They have been exposed to the Criminal Justice System enough to ferret out its weaknesses and have examined the inconsistencies. Usually, this results in a destruction of respect for the law which is aggravated by the fact that very few jails have codified regulations or written rules of conduct.

Almost at the opposite end of the spectrum is the "first-offender." Usually young, frightened and naive, the only characteristic he shares initially with the repeater is that he, too, is concerned about what the Criminal Justice System will dictate for at least a portion of his life. At this point in time, ties to the outside world through families and friends are usually strong and reinforcing, acting as a maintenance mechanism to his identification with the free world. But as time passes and as greater exposure to both the system and its usual inhabitants takes place, the stress produced chips away at both the first offender's relationships and identifications with the free world, almost seductively mandating that he or she change. The more oppressive the environment, the less likely it is to tolerate individual differences, and this phenomenon operates on all residents of our jails.

The next largest category is the inmate whose case is on appeal. It is the general observation that this type of prisoner is "in suspense" as is his fate. If it can be said that a person can possibly maintain a "holding pattern" this would be an apt analogy. This prisoner knows the "motions of decorum" necessary for survival within the institution, the informal and formal channels of communication, status demarkations and political structures, and because of his tenure, both past and anticipated pending hearing of his appeal, exemplifies what many would call the behavior of "a model inmate."

But, the basis of his behavior is not due to his "rehabilitation" but to his perceptiveness of the urgencies, and priorities of both the staff and his fellow inmates.

The smallest major category found in jails are those inmates serving sentences locally for misdemeanor offenses. Because of the minimal security risk presented by this type individual and the usual brevity of sentence, he or she usually attains a "trustee" status through a work assignment that positions him in a much more informal contact and environment with both the staff and other inmates. More important, because of the fixed amount of sentence, the inmate is in a better position to reidentify with the free world.

Through his anticipation of a certain release date, he can more effectively posit his status as a "reintegrated" member of society.

The last category, for lack of a better term and because of the small numbers, is the "medley." This final grouping includes such incongruous elements as bench warrant prisoners, federals, immigrations, in-transits and those with court orders awaiting transfer to various other institutions and jurisdictions. These are not stressed too highly due to certain similarities grouping around the brief time frame in which they are held by the jail.

It appears that, from the preceding examples, the elements comprising the jail population are entirely too disparate and even in some cases potentially bi-polar to arrive at any single form of action and consistent approach with respect to vocational education programs.

Consider, too, that state law generally prescribes a rigid segregation of persons held in jails—pretrial first offenders from all others, by age groups, by types of offense, by prior criminal history, males from females, etc.

The segregation of inmates that must be observed in a jail poses still another frustration in the planning of programs. The inmate composition of any class must conform to highly compatible classification categories!

It was stated earlier that jails are, primarily, temporary holding facilities. Most in this nation are contained in a county courthouse, for greater security and convenience in moving inmates to and from court. Most are antiquated, and rarely was one constructed to incorporate "program space."

The overwhelming majority of jails are small. As an example, 70 percent of the jails in Texas have an average daily population of only ten or less inmates!

Jails are, too, notoriously understaffed. And, to a sad degree, with custodial personnel who have little more academic attainment than the average inmate! This suggests that a jail guard may deeply resent any effort to extend vocational training to inmates, and particularly any additional responsibility he may be assigned attendant to such programs.

These considerations tend to inhibit the development of education programs in jails. But the new social conscience, perhaps aroused by recent court decisions specifying rehabilitative practices, demands that we resolve and dissolve what we have heretofore construed "obstacles" to the advent of classrooms in jails.

To illustrate how "obstacles" may be overcome, permit me to tell you about Sheriff Jack Heard of Harris County, Texas. Upon assuming office in January 1973, he advised his staff that an Education and Rehabilitation Program for inmates would be implemented promptly.

The Harris County Program

Harris County is somewhat unique in that two county jails exist—one in the county courthouse in downtown Houston, and a larger facility located on a 640 acre tract 25 miles away. Collectively, our county jails rank among the largest in the nation. Our inmate population remains fairly constant at 2,500 per day, and the average length of stay—unlike most jails—is six months.

When the decision to implement an education program in the jail was made, it was realized that local government funding would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. We did not have appropriate or sufficient personnel to embark on such a venture. And our facilities may charitably be summarized as "less than desirable." It was determined that the vocational training programs would be conducted primarily at the rural facility.

So, our first mission was to re-survey the facility and "compromise" for classroom space. We found that a second-floor hallway could be utilized for classes . . . a storeroom off the kitchen could be converted to a "learning situation" . . . an outside barn could suffice as a training room . . . and our Chapel and dining room could serve dual purposes. We resolved one impossible obstacle—space for classes.

Next, we went courting—and wed ourselves to a local community college. They liked our proposal; for them to conduct academic and vocational programs in the jail—and to transfer students, upon their release from confinement, to a same ongoing course at a college campus location.

They applied, successfully, for a start-up grant from the Texas Education Agency to provide them initial operating expenses and to purchase equipment and supplies for five vocational courses—the maximum number our existing facilities could accommodate at that time. It was also determined that the T.E.A. would accord the college "contact hour" reimbursement for all students attending courses in jail, thus insuring continuous funding for teacher salaries, instructional supplies, and other college costs.

The courses they selected to conduct in jail, based on job demands in this area and our operational needs that might be supplemented by trained inmates, were Air Conditioning and Refrigeration, Auto Mechanics, Cooking and Baking, Radio and TV Repair, and Vocational Office Education. The Adult Basic Education courses extend through the G.E.D. level. Since that time, we have expanded our vocational offerings to include Commercial Art and Drafting.

Simultaneously, we submitted a grant application to the Governor's Criminal Justice Council for funds to provide an Education and Rehabilitation administrative staff, textbooks, and to pay tuition for students who continued a course at the college upon release from jail. Our grant, too, was funded.

Our next monumental effort was to develop Policy and Procedures for operation of the program. Guided perhaps more by "horse sense" and limited practical experience than "profound theory and wisdon," we made several fundamental decisions:

- that the program would be open to all categories of inmates who could meet meticulous screening criteria: pre-trial, those with sentences on appeal, or those serving county sentences;
- that enrollment and continuance in the program would be strictly voluntary on the part of the inmate;
- that we would employ all precautions and measures available to us to insure that "the right person" was enrolled in "the right course;"
- that we would have to build as much "reward" into the program for inmates as good judgment and security would permit; and
- that post-release services and diligent follow-up would be critical to the eventual success and continuance of the program.

We realized that student attrition, for myriad and valid reasons, would be excessive and frustrating to the staff, the teachers, and other students. Instinctively, we knew that we would not have an inmate in a class a sufficient length of time to impart any appreciable degree of job skill or knowledge. Our greatest hope was, and remains, that we could at the least motivate the inmate to continue and complete the course in his "free world."

In developing our philosophy, we set out to "sell" the program to inmates and to encourage their applications. Their response was, and remains, overwhelming; we simply cannot meet the demand, so our student selection criteria has become more critical. Essentially, these are our priorities:

- the applicant's need for training;
- the applicant's intent to continue the training program upon his release from confinement;
- the applicant's compatibility with the training course requested; and, finally,
- the length of jail time remaining after entry into a training course.

It is, of course, virtually impossible—except for county inmates—to determine "how long" an inmate will remain in our facility. But we have found "clues" by considering his present offense, reviewing his past criminal history, and studying his jail card. Before admitting an inmate into a program, we determine—to the best of our ability—that the inmate will remain in our jail for at least three months, the time required to complete a training phase.

All applications from inmates are acknowledged immediately, and if a person is ineligible for a course he is fully apprised of the reason. Those who meet tentative acceptance requirements are interviewed individually by a counselor. A Student Selection Committee then reviews each applicant's file and makes a final determination of acceptance into a program.

After enrollment in a course, students must maintain satisfactory discipline and academic progress. The "rewards" he may accrue are as extensive as we are in a position to extend:

- A letter to a family member designated by him is sent by the Sheriff announcing the inmate's "selection" for a training program and encouraging their added support in his efforts to improve himself. (And we are finding, incidentally, that these letters have in many instances, "initiated" rapport between the inmate and his family.);
- If he is in a "pre-trial" category, he is issued a letter when he goes to court confirming his voluntary participation in a training program. (Increasingly, judges are granting probation to students with the condition that they continue and complete the training program at the local college.);
- If an inmate enrolled in our program receives an order for transfer to the Texas Department of Corrections, we write to the Classification and Assignment Officer there requesting that the inmate be enrolled in a comparable training course in prison, or that he be assigned to a work-related job assignment;
- If an inmate-student is released from jail, we assist in his transfer to a college course if he desires to continue his training;
- Upon release from confinement, we also afford job placement and housing assistance, if the inmate desires such help. Throughout his training, he is advised of all community agency services available to him, and encouraged to contact a member of our staff if he requires particular assistance.
- If the inmate plans to move outside Harris County upon his release from jail—and some do—we will contact the appropriate agencies in the city where he plans to reside and make arrangements for his continuance of the training program.

While attending a course in jail, all inmates are automatically accorded a trusty status as soon as we may legally do so. Inmate students are not required to perform work assignments; but, if they elect to do so, we insure that their work schedule does not conflict with their class attendance and study assignments. This may seem, to some, that we are "coddling" students. Actually, we have an "excessive" number of inmates on hand–many more than we have inmate jobs or supervisory personnel to accommodate. So we believe that it is better to fill the inmate jobs with inmates who want to work and are not enrolled in an education program.

Extensive individual and group counseling is also accorded inmates enrolled in the education program, for we are firmly convinced that the development of healthy attitudes and good work habits is perhaps as important to an inmate as acquiring a job skill.

When the education program was implemented, inmates enrolled in courses were housed throughout our facility. The "Call Out" and movement of inmates from cells to classes and return was, to say the least, awkward. The resulting confusion served to "irritate" custodial personnel, staff, teachers, and students. All students did not have the same security classification, and we were frankly afraid to house them together. But the logistical problems demanded that we try "something." With great reservations, therefore, we created "School Tanks" and housed all students together. To our surprise and absolute delight, this has proved a wise decision. Many previous problems were resolved almost instantaneously, not the least of which was a marked improvement in student performance. It is heartening to observe a Black, Caucasian and Mexican student huddled with textbooks around a study lamp helping one another with their lessons. And students housed in school tanks generally keep their cells cleaner than other inmates, and maintain a self-imposed rigid discipline– and that self-discipline, and its fostering is truly the guiding goal of the program.

Traditionally, philosophy of incarceration has steadfastly clustered about one or other of two diametric poles–"throw away the key" or "molly coddle." There have been relatively few attempts to integrate the best of both into one cohesive force. This is what the Harris County Sheriff's Department Education and Rehabilitation Program has set out to accomplish. It has borrowed the humanistic concern (without the rescue) from the liberal pole and the alacrity and certainty of action from the conservative.

Any inmate once enrolled in the program knows exactly what his and our responsibilities are and the consequences for violating his contract with us. Infractions of rules or misconduct are not, as in the liberal pole, enjoined as environmentally predisposed because of a "sad home life" or the like, but rather laid squarely on the shoulders of the perpetrator. The ultimate strength of this program depends on the communication of a fundamental message: You are in control of your own behavior; you choose your own behavior, and in so choosing you accept the consequences of that choice.

Specifically, in reference to the above: The program is voluntary–from start to finish. The student fills out the application, chooses the class, chooses whether or not he or she attends or not, passes or fails, stays in the program or not and ultimately whether to spend a life in jail or in the free world. Nobody here rescues, prods, coddles or holds their hands. Students make it in this program because they choose to–or fail for the same reason. None of the staff owns individual failure.

The staff offers information, counsel, and straight plain talk. They do not lie, evade, or play games with the students and expect the same human decency from them. They will support but not rescue.

The contract which the student makes with the staff is sacred. The staff chooses not to break contracts.

The basic philosophy is that the students have worth but that they made mistakes in their behavior. That is quite different from saying they are worthless. The staff reinforces to the student, "you are what is inside you, your behavior is what you choose to let others see. You choose to prove us right or wrong in your own particular case."

We know that we are in control of ourselves. They want to be. We give them permission to do it.

These basic tenets are further reinforced by direct methodology: All the rewards built into the system such as the letters to court, family, etc., job placement and school assistance post-release and the like are based upon voluntarism and are earned.

If a student does poorly in class, his evaluation will reflect that. Conversely, if he has done well, that will be the verdict. The letter to court is given to the inmate. It is his or her decision whether to present it to the court. Upon release, each inmate is armed with the telephone numbers of community service agencies and key staff, however, it is entirely his or her choice to pick up the phone–once again: no rescue; human beings must learn to stand on their own two feet in order to survive.

The results are both encouraging and gratifying. Most of our students make it–even though the stress of operating a program in a county facility for both staff and students alike, with all of its unknowns, is a wearing one.

Our education program has recently passed its third anniversary. To this date, what we felt might be only "passing interest" on the part of inmates due to their criminal justice status has not been true. Inmates enrolled in our program maintain a profound interest in their studies.

Since advent of the program, the incidence of inmate offense reports has decreased dramatically. Inmates enrolled in programs rarely misbehave; inmates who want to get into training programs know that a disciplinary report will disqualify them.

Of the total 2,865 inmates who have been enrolled in our program, 351 have continued their course at a college campus location. Seventy-two percent have requested, and received, job placement assistance. Only 3.32 percent have been returned to our jail for the commission of new offenses–some of whom were enrolled in our program for only one week–some for only a day.

This, along with other aspects of the program, has caused the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to award us the coveted "Promising Project" title for two successive years.

Most important, however, is the fact that this program has demonstrated that education programs on a county level can produce positive results, even though the jail environment is not conducive to the operations of such programs, and that inmates who viewed themselves as failures, can, with some assistance, produce successes.

Conclusion

Today, the Harris County Commissioners Court is under Federal Court Order to construct a new jail facility. And the Sheriff, under the same Order, is directed to expand his Education and Rehabilitation Program for inmates.

Plans are underway for the construction of a single Harris County Jail in downtown Houston, immediately adjacent to the courthouse. Those plans, incidentally, include extensive space for vocational training and other inmate programs.

Coincidentally, the Texas Commission on Jail Standards was created by the state legislature in 1975 and charged with the responsibility to develop minimum standards for the construction and operation of county jails in Texas.

Those standards have been developed and published. May I cite just one of the standards which will be of particular interest to you: "Education and Rehabilitation Programs for County Jails 217.20.00. These rules are adopted under the authority of Article 5115.1, Texas Civil Statutes:

.001. Education and Rehabilitation Plan. Each detention facility shall have and implement a plan approved by the commission for inmate rehabilitation and education, which plan shall make maximum feasible use of the resources available in and to the community in which the detention facility is located. The plan may include programs for voluntary participation by inmates such as the following:

(a) testing and counseling in connection with:

  (1) alcohol or other drug abuse problems,
  (2) vocational rehabilitation,
  (3) academic and vocational aptitudes and goals,
  (4) job placement,
  (5) family problems, and
  (6) personal psychological or psychiatric problems;

(b) participating in an academic, library, reading, counseling, therapy, and/or training program.

.002. Library. Each detention facility shall have and implement a written plan for providing available library services to inmates.

.003. Criteria, Eligibility. Reasonable criteria for eligibility shall be established, and an inmate may be excluded or removed from any class or activity for failure to abide by facility rules and regulations.

.004. Continuity. If possible, the plan established under .001 above should be devised so that an inmate may continue the program upon release from the facility or when transferred to the Texas Department of Corrections."

What clearer instructions do we have for addressing ourselves to the vocational needs of inmates, without respect to the characteristics of the jails in which they are housed?

Consider, too, that this standard is gaining nationwide momentum.

SECTION EIGHT:

PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

- Personnel Development
- Success and the Vocational Education

PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT: VOCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

by Clarence Collier*

Typically in our institutions there are four (4) major objectives as seen by the staff:

1. Degree Programs
2. Certification
3. Improving Skills
4. To Upgrade Practitioners for Promotion

Another way of defining personnel or staff development is the process of assisting employees through individualized or group situations to examine their goals and the goals of the organization. From this analysis the task of synthesizing and validating the consensus of findings, judgments and personal relationships becomes an ongoing or continuous process. You can sense personnel development problems when you wonder why morale is low, or what has happened to the attitude of people.

I have selected two (2) dimensions that I would like to present for your reaction. The first of these is an examination of some of the more important factors creating the need for us to give attention and allocate priorities to personnel development. A second set of ideas for you to consider is related. They consist of several personnel or staff development activities that we in vocational-correctional education should address.

Suppose we return to the topic of causative factors or influences that are directing our attention to staff development. Let me enumerate eight, and these are by no means a complete listing.

1. There has been an excessive increase in the number of individuals being restrained in the criminal justice system. In many instances populations have doubled during the last decade—this is the situation in Florida. Incarcerated individuals have had many educational constraints placed on them. Consequently one of their important needs is to develop a saleable skill. Reflect on the following data and interrelate the information. From a study of seven thousand incarcerated felons in Florida, the following was revealed:
   - Median age group was twenty-two to twenty-five.
   - 56 percent serving their first prison sentence.

---

*Clarence Collier is Assistant Professor, Adult and Vocational Correctional Teacher Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida. This paper was presented for Mr. Collier by Dr. Donald P. Jaeschke, Associate Professor, Adult and Vocational Correctional Teacher Education, University of South Florida.

- 54 percent had an average I.Q. or better.
- 84 percent had not completed high school.
- 80 percent were unskilled in any occupational area.

There are several messages that we can draw from this data. However, it is evident that one signal is loud and clear to us in education—we have a commitment to structure a comprehensive educational program that will equip an inmate with both academic and vocational skills.

2. The second factor giving emphasis to the need for personnel development is the thrust and expediency during the last few years in which vocational programs were initiated. How valid were legislative edicts, public opinion and administrative decisions? Are they founded on a sound philosophical, psychological, economical and sociological bases? We think not. These kinds of conditions conceived in expediency, necessitate special kinds of staff devopment.

3. A third need placing emphasis on personnel development is the recruitment, selection and employment of vocational personnel—those in administrative, teaching and ancillary services. There is a difference between the role of a vocational teacher or staff member in the criminal justice system and one in the public school role; yet these differences have not been clearly identified. Such data coupled with data about whatever is filling the void, needs to be analyzed. The resulting findings will suggest an important area for personnel development plans. The teacher working with inmates has a definite transitive role that needs attention.

4. The fourth and a very frustrating need giving rise to the necessity of maintaining communications is fiscal planning and budgeting. Historically, there has been little to no monies from the various sources that have financed public education. In the criminal justice system, the competition for the dollar becomes keen within the system and there are other needs that have to be met—some of these such as food and space are essential, however, a function of staff development is to help personnel understand or become knowledgeable of how priorities are established and what their role relationships remain or become.

5. The fifth concern which is having an impact on programs and the instructional methods, techniques and procedures, is the length of an individual's prison sentence. Recent studies indicate that among the youthful groups their confinement ranges from ten to fifteen months. How does this affect our educational prescription and as a vocational staff what can we do effectively in this time frame?

6. The sixth need affecting every staff member is the physical facility—the educational plant. Every vocational teacher is a laboratory manager. Often this involves either the planning of new facilities or alterations to existing ones. It is essential also that harmonic relationships exist within the group so that maximum utilization of physical resources can be achieved.

7. The seventh concern which gives impetus to staff development is one that, in my personal opinion, has created many problems among all staff personnel in correctional institutions. It is the problem of having employees not informed or not knowledgeable of the institution, policies, role relationships, administrative procedures. Institutions are created by

man to achieve an objective. It becomes incumbent on us that we assist individuals in understanding of these governees and in finding his role.

8. Finally is a need that necessitates group infraction. It is being able to follow-up and evaluate our efforts. This is done by not only following the progress of inmates within a program, but their exits from a program. We know that there are not many alumni groups of inmates formed following their departure from correctional education programs. However, we do know we are in a period of accountability; mandates are being given to us and we must respond by collectively developing the procedures and instruments to assess and modify our educational objectives.

Having spoken to our needs for personnel development, there seems to follow several kinds of activities and programs which these needs invite:

- As we have developed a comprehensive state plan for other public education, there is a need for a viable institutional state plan for offender rehabilitation staff development designed by the entire staff which can be used as a guide to follow and revise.

- There is a vital need for an orientation program for the new-comer. This organized effort should be understood and used to facilitate the adjustment of an individual to the correctional setting.

- Of vital importance is keeping staff informed of "mainstream" activities, both in and out of the institution—this forum or communication seminar, whatever the form, should systematically bring guest speakers in about curriculum, behavioral modification, guidance, etc.

- A teacher education system which is carried to the institution should include:

  a. Pre-service programs
  b. In-service program—B.S. and M.A. degrees
  c. Certification needs, etc., and
  d. Skill development as the need for the skill is assessed

- A developmental program is needed for developing or emergent leaders. It can be an organized program sponsored either by one institution or in collaboration with some other agency such as a community college to provide skills for select staff who will in turn assist other teachers areas such as vocational-technical curriculum, guidance and counseling, evaluation, behavioral objectives, transactional analysis, values clarification, awareness and Gestalt therapy. Use of internships or exchange programs should be a part of the design.

- To promote the occupational development and updating of their craft, vocational instructors need to return to industry briefly, or industry should be brought to the institution.

- We believe it is imparative to involve staff with other agencies, state departments of education, community colleges, government, colleges, universities and federal agencies.

- We must engage our instructors in correctional institutions in self-study and evaluation—using the Southern Association's *Standards and Self Study Handbooks,* we have visited informally with vocational teachers, evaluated their programs and shared our assessments with the participant and because it has been the request of the teachers we have shared the results with the superintendents of the institution.

- Research is needed—our hunches should become working hypotheses. Currently we need a formative, not summitive kinds of assessments—few staff are skilled in transactional research, the classical models which fit horse racing and agriculture are not the tools we need, and they are the tools most researchers are trained to use.

Finally, isolation, is the best single word descriptor that identifies the present problem common to most of our staff. It is lonely out there—people who work with losers need to have frequent battery charges less they lose their compassion and respect.

PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

by Ted Shannon*

For many years job training classes were offered in Ohio's correctional institutions on a rather informal, unstructured basis. In adult institutions these programs were frequently taught by inmate instructors supervised by guards, and in youth institutions the classes were taught for the most part by tradesmen who did not hold teaching certificates. It seems that many of these programs may have existed more for the benefit of the institutions than for the purpose of teaching saleable job skills to incarcerated individuals.

Various incidents and situations in the1960's resulted in some on-site visits and evaluations by the Ohio Department of Education's Division of Vocational Education. The bottom line of each of the final reports was always the same: that there were no vocational programs being taught within the institutions. The old job training programs did not begin to meet even the most minimal program standards set forth by the Division of Vocational Education.

These kinds of not-so-very-positive evaluations helped to set the stage for a number of serious, in-depth studies that looked very closely at the nature and function of all educational programs within the adult and juvenile correctional departments. The real turning point came in 1971 with a massive combined effort by the Ohio Division of Vocational Education and the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. The results of this most significant study had far-reaching implications in the adult correctional system and in the Ohio Youth Commission in terms of expanded school recognition in both agencies. Vocational education was investigated heavily, and the study set forth as one of its primary recommendations that all so-called "vocational" programs within the institutions be upgraded to meet minimum Ohio Department of Education standards in order that they might become approved programs similar to public school programs, and that persons teaching those programs be provided the opportunity to work toward full teacher certification like their public school counterparts.

Key administrators wasted no time in formulating a unique inter-agency contractual agreement that was in full operation by 1972. At the state level, two new positions were created. One was a state supervisor's position and the other, a teacher educator's position. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction and the Ohio Youth Commission each agreed to pay one-fourth of each of the two salaries, and the Ohio Division of Vocational Education agreed to pay the remaining half of each of the salaries. The supervisor, it was determined, would work out of the Division of Vocational Education's central office in Columbus, and the teacher educator would work out of the faculty for vocational-technical education at the Ohio State University in Columbus. The efforts of both positions were to be devoted exclusively to working with vocational programs and teachers in Ohio's two correctional systems.

---

*Ted Shannon is a Correctional Teacher Educator in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Well, that was how the plan looked in 1972 and that is how we're working it today in Ohio. The initial persons in each of those positions accepted the positions in 1974, and that is when I came on as teacher educator and also when Mr. Neil Johnson, who is also at this conference, accepted the state supervisor's position. Today we have about a hundred approved vocational programs in the adult and juvenile correctional systems, about 90 percent of which are Trade and Industrial Programs. The supervisor's main function is to visit periodically all programs in each of the twelve institutions in order to ascertain that there is compliance with state standards so that program approval may be maintained. His other key duties include approving new vocational programs and also approving the credentials of persons who apply to teach in vocational programs in Ohio's correctional institutions. When a new person has been given the green light by the Department of Education to teach, my work begins.

In Ohio, any vocational teacher who secures a job teaching in a correctional institution is subject to precisely the same teacher certification standards as any teacher on the street. Now, most of our programs in the institutions are, as I mentioned earlier, T & I offerings. In Ohio the minimum standards for approval for a person to pursue certification in that area require at least seven years of gainful employment in that trade and either a high school diploma or a G.E.D. State Department certification requirements leading to full certification, the first level of which in Ohio is a four-year provisional certificate, call for eighteen months of supervised teaching experience and completion of the equivalent of twenty-four quarter hours of teacher improvement work at an approved university which, in the case of corrections, is the Ohio State University. Persons going through this program hold one-year, or temporary, vocational teaching certificates until all requirements are met. This generally results in a person holding either two or three such certificates depending on the point in time at which he or she was hired.

The twenty-four quarter hour plan that I am responsible for is broken down into four basic phases. First, all of our new teachers attend a four-week preservice workshop held each August on the campus of the Ohio State University. The second phase comprises the academic year, from September to May, where in I make twice-a-month on-site visits to each new teacher inside the institution where he or she is teaching. In June of the second summer, the in-service teachers all return to a two-week follow-up workshop at Ohio State; that is the third phase. The fourth and final phase takes place during the second academic year wherein I make monthly on-site visits to each in-service teacher within the institutions.

My primary responsibility in this highly individualized in-service teacher education program is to begin working with a skilled tradesman and help him or her become a skilled teacher of that trade. My job is not so much determining what to teach as it is developing ways of how to teach it. For many persons this transition is quite a big step and not all of those who begin the program will complete it. To be making this transition from tradesman to teacher in a correctional setting is an even bigger step, so our in-service program must take on an even more specialized approach and incorporate many of the instructional strategies developed in special education. One fact that has been of great value in our overall program is that the state supervisor and myself have both had institutional teaching and administrative experience as well as experience in other special needs vocational programs. I would think that straight-line T & I men would probably have a somewhat difficult time relating to the very specialized situations that face our vocational teachers in correctional institutions.

What it boils down to, therefore, is the fact that our new vocational teachers in Ohio's correctional institutions go through the general two-year in-service teacher education program that is required of all new vocational teachers. Their program, however, is designed expressly for them and their unique teaching situations. When they're at that initial four-week workshop along with the public school teachers hearing about how to deal with parents and noon hall duty, I also in our small group sessions share with them some of the prison slang they're likely to hear. During our on-site conferences and observations throughout the school year, we're just as likely going to work on behavior management strategies as we are on shop lay-out and design.

Is it working? Well, this is almost a rhetorical question because the issue we're dealing with here has such far-reaching implications. I suppose that answering this question depends largely on what type of indicators a person looks at. Despite our teachers' salaries and working contracts which are generally lower and longer, respectively, than those of the public schools we seem to have a relatively smaller turnover rate than that of the public schools. One indicator in particular that I like to look at is the number of invitations received annually by our teachers to teach in the public schools. They seem to be recruiting a lot more of our teachers than we do theirs. This doesn't surprise me; I believe in our teachers, and I'd gladly match our teachers against those in the public schools any day of the week! One teacher who last year received three inquiries from public schools has already received four more this year. He's going to stick with corrections, though, because to him, that's where the action is. This man, who came on three years ago lacking even his G.E.D., is now fully certified and is firmly on the track toward earning his B.S. degree. Yes, he's exceptional, to be sure, but the surprising thing is that we have several more like him teaching in our institutions in Ohio.

SUCCESS AND THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATOR

by Karl Davidson*

Failure is the number one enemy of the over 21,000 inmates in the Texas Department of Corrections. It comes frequently and in many forms . . . they have failed in adapting to the laws of society, which is evident, but more importantly to us, as educators, the majority have failed in the traditional norm-referenced educational system. The evidence of this fact is overwhelming. Eighty-five percent of the inmates in the Texas Department of Corrections are school dropouts.

To eliminate the educational stigma engrained in the subconscious of the inmate by many years of failure, we begin by educating our vocational teacher through a four-day in-service workshop. The main thrust of this workshop is to develop in the teacher an awareness of self-image psychology, the effect success has on an individual, and the proper techniques that will give each inmate a positive self-image by providing opportunities to succeed, to succeed "daily."

To demonstrate how we develop awareness in our vocational teachers, let me take you into my workshop classroom. Of course, my students are, in this case, four hard-nosed auto-mechanic teachers, each with the words, "I dare you to teach me anything new," indelibly written on their faces. We must first realize that there is a twofold problem. One, the vocational teacher is uninvolved due to past irrelevent educational experiences, and two, we have the uninvolved student plaqued with his fear of past failures. Here we have a case of failure dictating to the teacher and student that it hurts less to become uninvolved, than to take the chance to fail again. With that in mind, back to the workshop and to solving the problem of getting the uninvolved, involved.

The first objective of the teacher in-service workshop is to involve the teacher, make him part of the workshop and not just a spectator. This involvement is critical to the success of the entire workshop. To achieve this objective, a question is immediately asked of each teacher, "When was the last time you were complimented, I mean sincerely complimented for a job well done?" That question brings many surprised looks from the teachers. Then with a broad smile each begins to relate a pleasant experience to the rest of the teachers. Then, whamo! Another question. "How did this make you feel?" (Notice here we asked what they felt and not what they thought.) Through this questioning strategy, two objectives were achieved: one, teacher involvement, and two, an introduction to the concept of self-image. Before they have time to take a good breath another question, "What could this possibly have to do with vocational education?" After each teacher has given his thoughts concerning the question, we involve him again by having him define the word "success." Then bomb shell number one: "When was the last time you gave a student an opportunity to succeed in class?" Most admit that it has been too long. The teacher is beginning to relax and participate freely in the roundhouse discussion. At this point, bomb shell number two: "I guarantee success to each of you; I guarantee you will leave the four-day workshop with at least five new techniques that will make you a more effective and efficient teacher." Now to the meat of the work—the specific objectives to be achieved for each of the four days are laid out in a logical, sequential order in the form of terminal objectives, what is to be achieved daily in summary form; then, the enabling objectives delineating each item to be taught, again in a logical, sequential order.

---

*Karl Davidson is Vocational Supervisor, Windham School District, Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Texas.

Day One:	Success and Self-image Performance-based Education Terminal-enabling Objectives
Day Two:	Units of Instruction
Day Three:	Specific Teaching Techniques
Day Four:	Teacher's Day

After establishing the objectives for each day we begin on day one. Day one is devoted to developing the concept of self-image psychology and its importance to education. The next sequential step is to stress the responsibilities of a vocational teacher in the State of Texas to teach knowledge (cognitive), skills (psychomotor) and through successes in these two domains develop a positive self-image. Next the importance of setting specific attainable objectives for each student daily is presented. Then one of the most important laws of learning is presented. The law states that in order for a student to learn, the material presented must be in a logical order showing relationships and in sequential order. A transparency is used to illustrate this; it consists of a map with dots to denote the locations of cities without the actual names of the cities. They are told to get ready for a trip, a trip with a point of origin, and with a final destination known only to me. Each has his turn guessing the route city by city then the final destination. An analogy is drawn between specific step-by-step plan to reach their final educational destination. This activity proved to be extremely successful, in that it showed them how the student is left to guess what is to be taught, in what order it is to be taught, and the final destination or terminal objective to be achieved.

The next question to be answered is how can knowledge and skills be presented so that a destination is clearly defined. This is where performance-based education comes in. Another teacher exercise is used to illustrate the use of terminal and enabling objectives as they apply to a unit of instruction. This exercise incorporates a transparency which has five letters of a nonsense alphabet. One of the teachers volunteers or is appointed the job of teaching the new alphabet. After completing the teaching activity, the presentation effectiveness is evaluated by asking each teacher to write the word CAT using letters in the newly learned alphabet. In a majority of the cases, teacher scores are extremely low. Then another transparency is used that gives a specific performance objective stated as follows: After successful completion of the exercise, the teacher will be able to spell the word CAT using the "new" alphabet. This knowledge will be demonstrated by a score of 100 percent on post-test. Then these questions are posed: "What letters would be taught?" "In what order would they be taught?" "Which two of the five letters would be eliminated?"

At this time, several heads begin to nod in approval. The next objective for the teacher to accomplish is to learn the method of writing terminal and enabling objectives using specific measurable terms. The remainder of Day One is spent writing and critiquing terminal and enabling objectives.

Day Two begins with a brief summary of what had been achieved by each teacher. One by one, each teacher is asked to stand before the group and present his feelings concerning Day One's activities. This is done for primarily two reasons, one, of course, is for the sake of repetition and the other is to provide immediate teacher involvement. The objective of Day Two is to tie the use of terminal and enabling objectives to a unit of instruction. The first material presented deals with each of the eight components of a unit of instruction and the purpose of each. Each teacher is then given a slip of paper with a broad topic (example: G. M. alternator) that will be taught Day Four. Using the knowledge and skills previously acquired, the teacher develops a complete unit of instruction. In addition he will develop each transparency for his presentation. This is the point where things begin to happen. The teacher is provided the opportunity to try out his newly acquired skill and succeed. The uninvolved become suddenly involved.

Day Three is devoted to acquiring new teaching techniques to be utilized when presenting their unit of instruction Day Four. The nine laws of learning are presented and the teacher is given examples of how they would use them to their benefit. The laws of repetition, relating new to old (association) and evaluation are stressed.

Questioning techniques are refined using the six "W's," "H" and "I." A handout is given out containing the do's and don't's of questioning. During Day Four each teacher is required to ask at least one question which contains the six "W's," "H" and "I"–the next step is to examine the reasons for using the five-stage lesson plan. Each stage is discussed separately with input from the teacher as to how he will utilize it. Then the five senses and their relative importance to education are presented. Emphasis is given to the senses of sight and hearing. The importance of a demonstration is illustrated by an exercise where the teacher is instructed to construct a paper cup from regular size typing paper. Using a filmstrip as an aid, three methods are used to teach construction of the cup. The first is simply that the teacher is told how to make the cup without being shown the steps. There has yet to be anyone to construct the cup by being told. The second method is to be shown how without any verbal instruction. Only three of the fifty-five teachers were successful using the shown method. The third method was to "show and tell." Each teacher was able to succeed with the third method. The competition between teachers was unbelievable. You would have thought the prize was $10,000 for the best cup. The conclusion was unanimous, that showing and telling simultaneously is by far the best method of presenting a new skill.

The "Big Day," Day Four had finally arrived. With their unit of instruction in hand and a stomach full of butterflies, they prepare to teach a thirty-minute lesson. The lesson is video-taped with one camera on the teacher and one on the students to determine how well the teacher interacts with his students. As one teacher presents his lesson, the other teachers fill out an evaluation form. The form evaluates the use of the five stage lesson plan, questioning techniques, repetition, association, effective motivation, use of overhead, step-by-step presentation and summary. Flander's interaction analysis is used as an additional tool to measure participation of the student. After each lesson, the inmate students are given an evaluation based on each enabling objective. The evaluation is immediately graded and returned to the teacher to help him determine his effectiveness. In addition, the video tape is replayed to pinpoint strong points of the presentation as well as areas that need improvement.

The most gratifying moment of the entire workshop is when the teacher begins to exit the workshop classroom. Those hard-headed auto-mechanic teachers that I spoke of a few minutes ago are amazed at what they have achieved. Over the four-day workshop each teacher's attitude has made a complete 180° turn. They experienced something we all seek . . . "success."

SECTION NINE:

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

- Interagency Cooperation
- Interagency Cooperation in the Future

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

by Eugene Lehrmann*

The sense of hopelessness, despair and retaliation which pervades our inner cities is, to a large extent, based on unemployment. CBS News ran a special report on national television a few weeks ago which vividly depicted a disparaging commentary on our times—youths running rampant in the Bronx communities of New York City—burning, pillaging, mugging, stealing and looting as a result of their anguish against society, including the world of work, which seemingly held no promise for them. I am confident you have met and encountered a number of people with similar feelings and problems. They are quite prevalent, I suspect, in the correctional institutions throughout our country.

The problem of unemployment is multi-faceted. The repercussions of unemployment are most strongly reflected in the incidents occurring in our inner-cities because of their population density and a seemingly bureaucratic inability to cope with the problem. However, examples exist in a wide variety of locales nationwide—including rural America.

The underlying theme of the CBS report vividly exposed the fact that the example, which occurred in the Bronx, grew, nurtured and multiplied in intensity out of a strong lack of a sense of purpose for living. It is almost incomprehensible that in this day and age of plenty and progress—1977, after sixty years of the most revolutionary advances in the history of mankind—that such a depressing social/economic condition should exist anywhere in our great country. But it does. You know it. I know it. The public is somewhat aware of it.

Where does the responsibility for this situation lie? What factors contributed to the evolution and precipitation of this problem? Why is our highly skilled technological society seemingly incapable of dealing with these human issues? What are the implications for Corrections and Vocational Education? Where do we go from here?

As the CBS report reached the point where any solution—social/economic or political, seemed completely out of reach of our available resources—the scene shifted to a New York City funded CETA project which provided training and wages to young Bronx residents for rebuilding and remodeling a small number of the hundreds of burned out apartments. On the spot interviews with the young workers revealed that they had a sense of purpose which could effectively be built upon thorough meaningful employment. Certainly, this did not solve the entire problem, but the seeds of purpose were sown and success breeds success—especially on a neighborhood basis.

We could spend the rest of the day probing the areas of responsibility and the factors contributing to the evolution, precipitation and maintenance of this situation in our urban and rural areas.

---

*Eugene Lehrmann is State Director for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, Madison, Wisconsin.

Like most of the problems prevalent in the social arena—we would be hard pressed to pinpoint the exact source of the ailment. It is better that we attempt to concentrate our energies and talents on findings ways to do what we can—in our place—with our talents and resources—to try to alleviate some of the pain, suffering, deprivation and its accompanying vehicle of crime on the streets, which appears to be closely associated with an almost universal lack of a sense of purpose for useful and productive living in a manner acceptable to and respected by our social order.

The problem is complex, extremely difficult to analyze and above all—one that can easily be shoved aside by departments, bureaus, divisions and individual public servants and administrators like you and me—if we continue to exist in isolation from one another within the federal, state and local bureaucracies.

I am not sure that the problem can be completely solved or even drastically reduced in scope—but I am confident of this much:

1. It is not getting any better!
2. It is not being solved very fast through the present systems!
3. It can not be solved or alleviated unless we all work together!

This brings us to the topic for this paper—Interagency Cooperation. What does this term really mean? How can it help? How can it be brought about realistically and effectively and what consequences may be expected as a result of its implementation?

Interagency cooperation means the working together, politically and programmatically, of all agencies involved with a particular target group toward a common goal. This is my definition. You may wish to rephrase it, add words, delete words or whatever—but please do not tamper with or redirect the meaning of:

1. Working together!
2. Particular target group!
3. Common goal!

These three components of the definition are sacred in that nothing much will happen unless all three are present, understood and agreed upon by all parties concerned. It would be of little value to the public if we all agreed to work together, but toward an un-common goal. (Such as education vs. punishment, for example) or work detail vs. meaningful job training and so on.

These are real and live differences of opinion which exist and prevail among ourselves and our colleagues. They have to be openly confronted, discussed, compromised and agreements reached before the working together can really be effective.

The particular target group is also a critical element in the interagency equation. There are various subgroups within the target group. They must be identified, respected as to their individual characteristics and needs and worked with accordingly. Such subgroups as the functionally illiterate, those requiring extensive social support services, medical support services, psychological support services and the list goes on. You know the subgroups better than I. I only draw your attention to them here briefly, to help place the interagency cooperation lens in proper focus. By so doing, we begin to unravel the equation and identify the agencies involved.

Lets go back for a moment to the element of common goal. In the beginning, I stated that the Bronx example, vividly documented by CBS, grew, nurtured and multiplied in intensity out of what seemed to be a strong lack of purpose for living. This lack of purpose is not very difficult to relate to lack of a meaningful job. Unemployment among inner-city residents and especially blacks is at staggering levels this very moment. Fifty percent is not uncommon in the ghettos. Where would any of us be and what would we be doing—as a result of our inner feelings and attitudes—right now if we were chronically unemployed, unmotivated, uneducated and influenced by the many negative conditions (social & economics) which are prevalent, during the formative years of young ghetto residents? It's not a very pleasant thing to think about, is it? We are all very fortunate and hopefully all very grateful to be where we are. But, in their eyes (those we have been talking about) we appear to be the "elite" and they tend to reject us with the rest of the establishment. This complicates the problem. How do you even get through to them? How do you help them? Do you want to them? That's the real question!

I think you do, but convincing them is something else. That, in my opinion, is where we have fallen down, and have a long way to go—convincing them!

We have not been able to convince them, because we have been doing our own thing—in our own way—in our own place without a common goal among cooperating agencies. In most instances, we have been treating everyone as if they were all out of the same mold with the same characteristics—same needs—and so what? I can't do much about it anyway. I am all alone out here and no one really cares much.

Perhaps my words are too negative. I am sure they are. But sometimes one has to be to make the point that must be made. That point is COOPERATION. It's the only way any of our social/economic/political problems are going to be solved. Ours is no exception.

Notice I say ours! It is our problem. It is our problem as citizens of these United States—it is our problem as public servants and public administrators--it is our problem as officials in the fields of corrections, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, job services, manpower, criminal justice, public health, civil service, higher education, elementary and secondary education, state departments of administration, law enforcement, commerce, and above all the executive, legislative and judicial branches of our federal, state and local governments.

In Wisconsin, the Division of Corrections has a long history of seeking cooperation and assistance from a variety of state agencies including vocational education with a view toward the constant upgrading of its correctional programs.

In the spring of 1972, the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education offered to accredit vocational-technical courses and programs within the state's correctional institutions. Accreditation required upgrading faculty, programs and equipment to meet State Board standards, and qualify inmate-graduates for a vocational diploma or associate degree in skills and knowledges acceptable to employers.

Courses pursued behind-the-walls were made transferable to any of Wisconsins sixteen comprehensive VTAE district vocational-technical institutes for those who are released prior to completion of their occupational pursuit.

The accreditation program required cooperative administrative, budgetary, and educational relationships between the local District VTAE's and the nearby Correctional Institutions on a scale never before attempted. Further the graduation diploma and educational records would be administered by the District VTAE, with no reference to the inmate's incarceration. This procedure would permit the employer to evaluate the paroled inmate seeking employment solely on the basis of his vocational and/or technical skills.

An Inter-Agency Committee on Correctional Education was formed to plan and implement this venture. The Committee consists of the agency heads of the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations (which includes Job Services) the State Manpower Services Council (which administers the CETA program) the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice, the Division of Corrections and the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education.

The Inter-Agency Committee on Corrections Education has been instrumental in encouraging the coordination and development and implementation by corrections and District VTAE's of a comprehensive program of vocational-technical education within the Wisconsin Correctional System. The Committee has set an example of expert leadership in coordination, communication, and program movement.

The reincarceration rate among graduates of vocational-technical programs has been 8 percent as compared to a much higher rate among non-program participants.

Thirty-eight (38) inmate/students have received vocational diploma from Northeast Wisconsin Technical Institute. The Moraine Park Technical Institute has issued 377 vocational diplomas and associate degrees to inmate/students of the Fox Lake Wisconsin Correctional Institution. Five (5) vocational diplomas have been issued by MPTI to incarcerated persons pursuing programs from Wisconsin State Prison, Waupun. Tayscheedah Correctional Institution students have received four (4) vocational diplomas from Moraine Park.

Another 1,847 inmate/students have successfully completed courses that can either be transferred or used to supplement their skills, and knowledges in a particular occupational area.

Needless to say both corrections and vocational education are very proud of this accomplishment over the three year period between 1973-76. It shows what can be done through inter-agency cooperation and working together with a particular target group toward a common goal. It goes without saying that our common goal was employment which in our opinion, is basic to acquiring a sense of purpose for living in our society.

We in vocational education view cooperation with corrections as a top priority! We have backed that attitude up with federal funding provided under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and its 1968 and 1972 amendments. We plan to continue doing so under the new 1976 Vocational Education Act. Hopefully, our state legislature will see fit to provide additional state funding to the division of corrections to supplement the federal funds.

Convincing the disadvantaged that you are there to help them acquire a sense of purpose is also a multi-faceted problem. It means seeing to it that the services you provide are real, relevant and righteous. Applied to vocational education in corrections this means high quality programs, up-to-date equipment and qualified highly skilled instructors who know and can speak for the employer as a result of their recent wage-earning contacts in business and industry. Anything less than this is in effective and on invitation to failure. The suspicious inmate/students will not believe you, but will probably use you to his or her best advantage.

This brings us to the political and programmatic elements of the definition. There must be a commitment to the common goal of employment on the part of the public through their representatives in the legislature and executive branches of government. This commitment may not be present. Some will not subscribe to it. Some will say lock them up and give us the jobs. The plot thickens--the problem is complex--socially, politically and economically.

Our best approach is by example. We have our assigned responsibilities by rule, regulation and statute. The rest is a moral and ethical responsibility. We can decide to work together or we can decide to work along--with or without adequate resources. Vocational education and corrections in Wisconsin are committed to working together. We hope to set an example that will attract the needed support and resources. We believe it has to come. Belief in any less of an ideal might tend to injure our own sense of purpose. We can not afford to let that happen!

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION IN THE FUTURE

by Robert E. Rodli*

The specific question that I shall address is "How can agencies cooperatively work together in the future as they improve vocational education programs for offenders?" This is a question that could and should be discussed by all agencies involved in the Criminal Justice System. I will, however, concentrate my comments on the role that I feel vocational education people can play in working with correctional industries' programs, and how they can help each other.

Correctional industries need the cooperation of the vocational education people in corrections, in an effort to improve programs for offenders.

The terminal objectives of vocational education and correctional industries are the same, and each can complement the other in helping the inmate make a successful transition to the working world.

Our primary area of operation is with correctional industries, thus I am not as familiar with your programs as I probably should be, in addressing this issue. I, too, am looking for more knowledge of your programs so as to have a better feel of how industries and vocational education can work cooperatively.

Our firm deals strictly with correctional industries, having installed over 200 plants in the last fifty odd years. My father had fifty years in the business, and I have somewhat over twenty years. There has been a situation that has disturbed me in many states that we visit. This is the "power struggle" for the better classified inmates by various programs. If I were an inmate, I would be most confused at times, feeling like a guinea pig. I have heard such expressions by institution administrators as "We are over-programmed," or "We spend a lot of money on theory and very little time on common sense." There are those who question the criteria for allocation of federal funds to certain programs. I like to believe that if there had been more interagency cooperation that more logical and viable solutions would be obtained to these questions.

A great percentage of the released inmates, if they are to be successful outside, will end up working in an industrial type of setting. It may be in the accounting office, production shop, warehouse, truck driving, etc. This is where the jobs are. You and I know that the majority will be industry-oriented jobs for which he will be applying. How do we best train him for finding his spot in industry?

As in outside industry, correctional industries must rely on a training staff to train people in the industrial vocations related to their particular production operations. With present emphasis on equal opportunity employment, private industry has been forced to train the unskilled people, so that they can properly take their place in the production setting, working with others, all geared to production oriented operation, certainly to make a profit. The majority of the people with whom we are dealing in corrections would be categorized in the hard-core unemployed and minority groups.

---

*Robert E. Rodli is President, John R. Wald Co., Inc., Huntingdon, Pennsylvania.

Correctional industries have been criticized for being concerned more with production and profit than training. I shouldn't have to remind you that production and profit is "the name of the game" on the outside. Productive and profitable industrial exposure is training.

It has been most difficult in recent years for correctional industries to do the job that they should; namely, to make a quality product, deliver it on time, and certainly make a profit. This takes training! It has been difficult because of the earlier mentioned "power struggle," industries having to take people that are available after the cream-of-the-crop has been allocated to other programs. Correctional industries have a tougher challenge today than ever before.

You people, working in the vocational education field, know as well as I do that the make-up of the inmate whom we have in the institution today is what could be referred to as a second generation welfare case. In many cases, their parents were on welfare, thus they have no motivation or incentive to work for a living. So they ask, "Why should we work in an institution?" The majority of them need the vocational education programs, in which you people are interested, before they qualify for production work.

Correctional industries need your cooperation in training people for industries, so that they can better achieve their goal. I would hope that you would recognize the industrial programs within a correctional institution can serve as a constructive transition program for those not qualified for work release, or having longer sentences, after having completed their respective vocational education training.

There are people in correctional industries, who are not appreciative of the vocational education programs. They are quite proud of the fact that on-the-job training within their shops is most valuable. To a degree, this may be a valid concept, just as outside where most of the training is on-the-job, hands-on experience. A majority of production workers hired on the outside are unskilled, such as material handlers, packaging operations, etc. For those jobs requiring more skills, there is a need for a cooperative role between vocational education and correctional industries.

Let me suggest some areas that I feel are worth considering.

Let's assume a state such as Illinois, Michigan, or any other of the larger states, that may have a sizable metal furniture fabrication plant operating within its institution. This shop would be making such items as steel shelving, lockers, filing cabinets, metal desks, etc. This industry also requires qualified clerical people, warehouse and inventory control people, tool and die set-up personnel, welders, press operators, assembly personnel, painting and finishing, packaging, etc. I would urge the vocational education people to coordinate their programs with this industry and gear their instructions to train inmates for jobs in this production setting. It certainly would be desirable to have a vocational shop that would teach the basic theory of welding, course for spray painting technology, etc. Once the man has completed his particular course, he then would be assigned to the industrial shop, where he can apply the skills that he has learned in the vocational program.

I might further suggest that the vocational education people work closely with the institution maintenance and construction departments. If bricklaying is being taught in the vocational schools, these men could be assigned to the maintenance/construction division following the training in vocational bricklaying. There, he can apply his newly acquired skills under practical conditions. There is a definite need for training in industrial electrical techniques to serve the maintenance/construction facilities, and industrial operations within correctional institutions. Maintenance, in many cases, in institutions around the country is minimal. At one time, this was not the case. Ten to fifteen years ago, we did have inmates within institutions who had these qualified trade skills.

I might suggest a program within vocational education to enlighten the inmates in the general, overall management of an industrial operation. Explain to them production planning procedures, inventory control methods, general personnel organization, management policies; all of these related to employment in industry.

I asked for input to this presentation from a close friend, recently retired from the field of corrections, being most active in the vocational education field. He returned, indicating that he felt vocational education should be concerned with training while industries should be concerned with production. I cannot disagree with him, however, if industries are to be concerned with production, they must have trained people. Working in industry is training! If a correctional industry operating within the confines of an institution is making a quality product, delivering on schedule and making a profit, somebody is doing some training!

In October 1975 Amos Reed who is now Secretary of Corrections in the State of North Carolina, made a talk before a workshop for improving vocational education in corrections at the Ohio State University. I wish he were here with us.

His address was titled "The Three R's of Vocational Education in Corrections." A reprint of his article appeared in the "Grapevine," November-December issue, 1975, this publication being one for prison wardens and superintendents. If I had the time, I would read through most of his address, which I think to a degree addresses the question originally asked to me. In reading the article, however, I noted a much-quoted, disturbing comment that I have seen too many times; namely, "one wonders where graduates will find appropriate employment in communities, where they may apply their skills learned in the License Plate Factory?"

I wrote to Amos, indicating that I did enjoy his article, however, indicated that he disappointed me as one of the few remaining "practitioners" and made particular reference to his somewhat non-supportive remarks on correctional industries, with particular reference to the License Plate Factories.

I indicated to Amos that it is unfortunate this particular industry carries the stigma that it does, when in fact it is one of the most realistic, production-oriented industries operating in corrections today.

If license plates were never made in a prison before and someone suggested this today, I am confident that the industry would be greatly accepted, on the fact that it is production-oriented, quality is of utmost importance, delivery schedules must be met, and the trades such as metal stamping, embossing, finishing, packaging, etc., are certainly relevant to outside industry.

Amos responded to my letter, indicating that he was convinced our seeming difference was one of semantics, rather than one of actual conflict in view; obviously lack of cooperation.

Amos further responded, "Properly, corrections is carried forward in a total sequence of master planning, coupled with continuous encouragement and support towards achievement of individually designed goals. Vocational education is a major service segment of this total correctional process, composed of five basic services: awareness, exploration, skill development, placement, and follow-up.

Correctional industries fit within this sequence as specialized components, spanning the advanced stages of skill development and the initial phases of placement. The service staging areas, through which individuals process on their way to placement in the community, once the student has become aware of the world of work and has some feel of area content and a basic grasp of the agencies that hire our graduates, tell us about the kinds of people they want. Each of us from our very disciplines, with our individual interests, has some pretty set ideas about what is wrong with the Criminal Justice System, and we believe we know what the best solutions are."

He further indicates, "In the past two or three years, there has been much discussion about the lack of communication between operating agencies and the criminal justice education programs. I believe one of the best ways to facilitate a continuing dialogue is through internship programs. This forces agency people and education people to discuss problems and goals and as a result, everyone benefits."

Several years ago, correctional industry people felt that they were not really getting the support and recognized there was a lack of communications between the administrators and the wardens. Industries took the initiative to program joint meetings with wardens and administrators at the various ACA conventions. This has proved most helpful to both groups. Might I suggest that the vocational education people in corrections, make an effort to set up joint meetings with the industrial people at one of the ACA conferences to discuss points that I have raised in the above, and hopefully answer some of the questions related to interagency cooperation and plans for the future.

APPENDIX

Exhibit A:

Conference Agenda

Exhibit B:

Conference Presenters and Participants

EXHIBIT A

Conference Agenda

PROGRAM

1977 NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

"Improving the Quality and Quantity of Vocational Education in Corrections"

Astroworld Hotel
Houston, Texas

May 16–18, 1977

Monday, May 16, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
9:00 a.m. – 12:00	**REGISTRATION**	Towers No. 1
1:00 – 3:15 p.m.	**FIRST GENERAL SESSION**	The Meeting Place No. 2
	Presider: Charles Whitson Criminal Justice Specialist The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	
	Opening Remarks: Duane M. Nielsen Chief, Vocational Education Personnel Development United States Office of Education Washington, DC	
	Cadar Parr Associate Commissioner Occupational Education & Technology Texas Education Agency Austin, Texas	
	W. J. Estelle Director Texas Department of Corrections Huntsville, Texas	
	Introduction of Keynote Speaker: Anthony P. Travisono Executive Director American Correctional Association College Park, Maryland	

Monday, May 16, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
1:00 – 3:15 p.m.	**EDUCATION AND PRISONS** The Honorable Claiborne Pell United States Senator Rhode Island **Conference Charge:** Robert E. Taylor Director The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	
3:15 – 3:30 p.m.	**BREAK**	
3:30 – 4:30 p.m.	**SIMULTANEOUS PROGRAM SESSIONS** (Choose one of four)	
	Alternative A: *Implications of the 1976 Education Act for Agency Cooperation*	Forum 1
	Presider: Duane M. Nielsen Chief, Vocational Education Personnel Development United States Office of Education Washington, DC	
	Presenter: LeRoy A. Cornelson Director of Planning Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education United States Office of Education Washington, DC	
	Alternative B: *Implications of the 1976 Education Act for Women's Equity in Corrections*	Forum 2
	Presider: Lane Murray Superintendent Windham School District Texas Department of Correction Huntsville, Texas	
	Presenters: Ruth M. Glick Chief, Correctional Planning California Department of Corrections Sacramento, California Eileen Lehman Title IX Coordinator United States Office of Education Region VI Dallas, Texas	

Monday, May 16, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
3:30 – 4:30 p.m.	**Alternative C:** *Funding Vocational Education Programs in Corrections* **Presider:** James Battle Coordinator, Vocational Education Programs Garden City School District Trenton, New Jersey **Presenters:** Raymond Bell Project Director National Correctional Education Evaluation Project Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania F. Patrick Cronin Criminal Justice Specialist The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	Forum 3
	Alternative D: *The Role and Utilization of Vocational Advisory Committees in Corrections* **Presider:** Byrl Shoemaker Director of Vocational Education State of Ohio Columbus, Ohio **Presenter:** Lowell Burkett Executive Director American Vocational Association Washington, DC	Towers 8
7:00 – 10:00 p.m.	**A TEXAS BARBECUE** 	The Meeting Place No. 2 & No. 3

Tuesday, May 17, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
8:30 – 9:45 a.m.	**SECOND GENERAL SESSION** **Presider:** Philip J. Tardanico Director of Education Massachusetts Department of Correction Boston, Massachusetts	The Meeting Place No. 2
	THE NEED FOR PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS Daniel Dunham Assistant State Superintendent for Vocational-Technical Education Maryland State Department of Education Baltimore, Maryland	
9:45 – 10:00 a.m.	**COFFEE BREAK**	
10:00 – 11:30 a.m.	**SIMULTANEOUS PROGRAM SESSIONS** (Choose one of four)	
	Alternative A: *Research Approaches to Planning and Accountability for Vocational Education Corrections* **Presider:** Paul Schroeder Personnel Development Specialist The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio **Presenters:** Ronald Waldron Correctional Program Specialist Division of Planning Federal Bureau of Prisons Washington, DC James Lewis Research Associate Pennsylvania Research Coordinating Unit Pennsylvania State Department of Education Harrisburg, Pennsylvania	Forum 1
	Alternative B: *Offender Job Placement* **Presider:** Harrison L. Morris Education Administrator Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Columbus, Ohio **Presenters:** Edward Gallagher Director of Manpower Development Massachusetts Department of Correction Boston, Massachusetts	Forum 2

Tuesday, May 17, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
10:00 – 11:30 a.m.	John Nunnery Administrator Employment and Training Administration United States Department of Labor (Region V) Chicago, Illinois	
	Allen E. Harbort Superintendent, Correctional Education Wisconsin Division of Corrections Madison, Wisconsin	
	Alternative C: *Job Market Information*	Forum 3
	Presider: Shelvy Johnson Assistant Education Administrator Federal Bureau of Prisons Washington, DC	
	Presenters: Brian Richey Regional Commissioner Bureau of Labor Statistics United States Department of Labor Dallas, Texas	
	John Armore Director Ex-Offender Program National Alliance of Businessmen Washington, DC	
	Alternative D: *Offender Needs and Interests/Adult*	Towers No. 8
	Presider: George Denton Director Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Columbus, Ohio	
	Presenters: Russell Leik Coordinator Mutual Agreement Programming Wisconsin Division of Corrections Madison, Wisconsin	
	T. P. Jones Assistant Secretary for Programs Deparmtent of Offender Rehabilitation Tallahassee, Florida	
	Reactor: Judson C. Locke, Jr. Commissioner of Corrections Alabama State Board of Corrections Montgomery, Alabama	

Tuesday, May 27, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
11:30 – 1:00	**LUNCH ON YOUR OWN**	Your Choice
1:00 – 2:30 p.m.	**SIMULTANEOUS PROGRAM SESSIONS** (Choose one of three)	
	Alternative A: *Vocational Needs and Interests of Juvenile Offenders*	Forum 1
	Presider: Christ L. George Superintendent of Education Ohio Youth Commission Columbus, Ohio	
	Presenters: Grady Decell Director, South Carolina Department of Youth Services Columbia, South Carolina and Vice President, National Association of State Juvenile Delinquincy Program Administrators	
	Trumble Kelley Educational Administrator California Youth Commission Sacramento, California	
	Christ L. George	
	Alternative B: *Approaches for Delivering Vocational Education in Corrections*	Forum 3
	Presider: Joseph Miller Director Post-Secondary Education Alabama State Department of Education Montgomery, Alabama	
	Presenter: Mary Ann Evan Coordinator of Correctional Education Oregon State Department of Education Salem, Oregon	
	Alternative C: *Personnel Development*	Towers No. 6
	Presider: Lawrence M. Aber Supervisor Division of Vocational Education Missouri Division of Corrections Jefferson City, Missouri	
	Presenters: Clarence Collier Director, In-Service Education Department of Offender Rehabilitation University of Southern Florida Tampa, Florida	

Tuesday, May 17, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
1:00 – 2:30 p.m.	Ted Shannon Correctional Teacher Educator Department of Vocational and Technical Education Trade and Industrial Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio Karl Davidson Vocational Supervisor In-Service Training Windham School District Texas Department of Corrections Huntsville, Texas	
2:30 – 3:00 p.m.	**BREAK**	
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.	**SIMULTANEOUS PROGRAM SESSIONS** (Choose one of three)	
	Alternative A: *Information Retrieval Systems: Who Needs Them?*	Forum 1
	Presider: Mark Newton Graduate Research Associate The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	
	Presenters: Paul Schroeder Personnel Development Specialist The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio Joseph G. Cady Director National Criminal Justice Reference Service Law Enforcement Assistance Administration United States Department of Justice Washington, DC	
	Alternative B: *The Development of Standards for Corrections*	Forum 2
	Presider: Mark A. Levine Commissioner Maryland Division of Correction Baltimore, Maryland	
	Presenters: Jack Heard Sheriff of Harris County Houston, Texas and Member, Commission on Accreditation, American Correctional Association	

Tuesday, May 17, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.	Charles Whitson Criminal Justice Specialist and Director The National Study of Vocational Education in Corrections The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	
	Alternative C: *Offender Needs in Short-Term Institutions*	Forum 3
	Presider: Kathleen J. McChesney Head Counselor New Orleans District Attorney's Diversionary Program New Orleans, Louisiana	
	Presenters: Alphonso K. Ford Assistant Commissioner in Charge of Programs The City of New York Department of Correction New York, New York	
	Ernestine H. Schnuelle Administrator of Correctional Education Central Jail, Education Department Los Angeles, California	
	Bill Broome Director, Research and Development Harris County Sheriff's Department Houston, Texas	

Wednesday, May 18, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
8:30 – 9:30 a.m.	**SIMULTANEOUS PROGRAM SESSIONS** (Choose one of two)	
	Alternative A: *Interagency Cooperation in the Future*	Forum 1
	Presider: Jim Mabry Commissioner Arkansas Department of Correction Pine Bluff, Arkansas	
	Presenters: Eugene Lehrmann State Director Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Madison, Wisconsin	
	Robert E. Rodli President John R. Wald & Co., Correctional Industry Services Huntingdon, Pennsylvania	
	Alternative B: *The Future for Technology in Vocational Education in Corrections*	Forum 2
	Presider: Maxia Ferris Vocational Supervisor Windham School District Texas Department of Corrections Huntsville, Texas	
	Presenter: Kenneth A. Polcyn Research Director Communication Satellite Applications PRC Information Sciences Company McLean, Virginia	
9:30 – 10:00 a.m.	**COFFEE BREAK**	
10:00 – 12:00	**THIRD GENERAL SESSION**	The Meeting Place No. 2
	Presider: Alton Ice Executive Director Texas Advisory Council for Vocational Education Austin, Texas	
	THE PROGNOSIS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS	
	Byrl Shoemaker Director of Vocational Education State of Ohio Columbus, Ohio	

Wednesday, May 18, 1977

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION
10:00 – 12:00	David Bland Commissioner Kentucky Bureau of Corrections Frankfort, Kentucky	
	Closing Remarks: Lorraine Furtado Personnel Development Specialist The Center for Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	
12:00 noon	**ADJOURN** *Have a Safe Trip Home!*	

EXHIBIT B

Conference Presenters and Participants

Lawrence M. Aber
Vocational Education Supervisor
Division of Corrections
911 Missouri Blvd.
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Marilyn Ambrose
Instructor
Vocational Education - SCCF
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

David L. Anderson
Program Specialist
Division of Vocational Education
120 E. 10th St.
Topeka, KS 66612

Donna Anderson
Coordinator, Special Projects
Mayor's Office Manpower Resources
701 St. Paul St.
Baltimore, MD 21202

Linda Andrews
Curriculum Specialist
Tucson Skill Center
55 N. 6th Ave.
Tucson, AZ 85701

Daniel L. Aquino
Director
Hoomana School
2109 Kamehameha Highway
Honolulu, HI 96819

Issa Azet
Director
Training and Employment Advocacy
Los Angeles Community College District
VA Hospital
Wilshire & Sawtelle
Los Angeles, CA 90005

James A. Barge
Director, Special Programs
Vocational Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

James F. Battle
Coordinator of Vocational Programs
Garden State School District
1901 N. Olden Ave.
Trenton, NJ 08618

Sam Beckwith
Director
Vocational Education
Tucker Reformatory
Tucker, AK 72168

Raymond Bell
Project Director
National Correctional Education
Evaluation Project
Lehigh University
524 Brodhead
Bethlehem, PA 18015

C. E. Benford
Assistant Director
Occupational Development
Regional Reception Centre
Kingston, Ontario, K71 4V7

Hal Birkland
Coordinator of Special Programs
Vocational-Technical Division
Department of Education
512 Capitol Square Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55101

David H. Bland
Commissioner
Bureau of Corrections
State Office Building
Frankfort, KY 40601

Merle Bodine
Director
Community and Special Projects
Vocational, Technical & Adult
Education
4802 Sheboygan Ave.
Madison, WI 53702

Christopher Bond
Postsecondary Education
Department of Education
State Office Building
Montgomery, AL 36104

E. T. Borders
Superintendent of Education
Youth Services
Box 21487
Columbia, SC 29221

Donna Boynton
Vocational Director
Taft Youth Center
Rt. 4
Pikeville, TN 37367

James Boynton
Teacher
Taft Youth Center
Rt. 4
Pikeville, TN 37367

Bill Brademan
Vocational Teacher
Giddings State School
Box 600
Giddings, TX 78942

John W. Bramblett
Director
Education & Rehabilitation
Office of the Sheriff
Houston, TX 77002

Bill Broome
Director
Research & Development
Harris County Sheriff's Department
301 San Jacinto
Houston, TX 77002

John T. Brown, Coordinator
Educational Services, District of
Columbia Dept. of Corrections
Suite 1008, 614 H St., NW
Washington, DC 20001

Lowell Burkett, Executive Director
American Vocational Association
1510 H St., NW
Washington, DC 20005

Corrinne Bush, Correctional Educator
La Puente Valley Adult Schools
Central Jail, 441 Bauchet St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Elliott R. Caggins
Educational Specialist
Federal Correctional Institution
3150 Horton Rd.
Ft. Worth, TX 76119

W. J. Carlson
Consultant
Health & Public Service Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Bradley Carter
Director
Records Management
Department of Corrections
804 State Office Building
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Joseph W. Cassidy
Coordinator
J. F. Ingram Technical Institute
Box 185
Deatsville, AL 36116

Jerrold J. Caughlan
Director
Inmate Education & Training
Philadelphia Prisons
8201 State Road
Philadelphia, PA 19136

Sol Chaneles
Chairman
Criminal Justice Department
Rutgers University
14 College Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Bard S. Chestney
Account Manager
Ryder Truck Rental
Box 520816
Miami, FL 33152

Robert J. Clark
Principal
Federal Correctional Institution
Fort Worth, TX 76119

Richard H. Clough
Supervisory Auditor
General Accounting Office
Suite 800, 1200 Main Tower
Dallas, TX 75202

Charles Cohen
Coordinator
Vocational Education
Federal Correctional Institution
Danbury, CT 06810

Dorris W. Colvin
Vocational Draftsman
Giddings State Home & School
Box 600
Giddings, TX 78942

Richard Comiskey
Vocational Counselor
State Correctional Institution
Box 200
Camp Hill, PA 17111

Gary Cook
Director of Education
Minnesota State Prison
Box 55
Stillwater, MN 55082

Mike Corbin
Director
Vocational Training
Department of Corrections
Box 188
Parchman, MS 38737

LeRoy Cornelson
Director of Planning
Occupational & Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20202

Leslie Wayne Craven
Program Coordinator
Correctional Division
Hacienda La Puente School District
441 S. Bauchet
Los Angeles, CA 90012

F. Patrick Cronin
Criminal Justice Specialist
The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Karl Davidson
Vocational Supervisor
Windham School District
Department of Corrections
Huntsville, TX 77340

Grady Decell
Director
Department of Youth Services
1720 Shivers Rd.
Box 3188
Columbia, SC 29203

George Denton
Director
Rehabilitation & Correction
1050 Freeway Drive North
Columbus, OH 43229

Maria B. Denzin
Management Analyst
Office of the Commissioner
HEW
400 Maryland Ave., SW FOB-6
Washington, DC 20202

Jerald W. Dowers
Education Coordinator
LCIS, Box 1056
DeQuiney, LA 70633

Daniel Dunham
Assistant State Superintendent
Vocational & Technical Education
Box 8717
Friendship International Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240

Edward B. Dyl, Jr.
Work-Study Coordinator
Baker Hall School
150 Martin Rd.
Lackawanna, NY 14218

K. Sue Eckermann
Home Economics Teacher
Giddings State Home & School
Box 600
Giddings, TX 78942

Marian Eppright
Public Relations
Southwest Iowa Learning Center
401 Reed
Red Oak, IA 51566

W. J. Estelle, Jr.
Director
Department of Corrections
Box 99
Huntsville, TX 77340

Mary Ann Evan
Coordinator
Correctional Education
Department of Education
942 Lancaster Dr., NE
Salem, OR 97310

Maxia Farris
Vocational Assistant Administrator
Windham School District
Department of Corrections
Huntsville, TX 77340

Alphonso K. Ford
Assistant Commissioner
Department of Correction
100 Centre St.
New York, NY 11411

S. Frank Fritsch
Director
Staff/Client Development
Bureau of Correction
State Office Building
Frankfort, KY 40601

Gerald W. Funk
Research Assistant
Department of Vocational Education
The Pennsylvania State University
110 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802

Lorraine Furtado
Specialist
The Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Edward Gallagher
Director of Manpower Office
Department of Correction
100 Cambridge St.
Boston, MA 02202

Shirley Gaylord
Department of Corrections
Windham School District
Box 40
Huntsville, TX 77340

Christ L. George
Superintendent of Education
Ohio Youth Commission
35 E. Gay St.
Columbus, OH 43227

Matthew Gill
Administrator of Educational Services
Department of Corrections
300 New London Avenue
Cranston, RI 02920

Ruth Glick
Chief, Correctional Planning
Department of Corrections
714 P St., Room 550
Sacramento, CA 95814

Rosetta Gooden
Graduate Research Associate
The Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Marvin Greer
Education Coordinator
State Correctional Institution
Box 9901
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

Louis D. Gregory
Vocational Guidance Coordinator
Allenwood Federal Prison Camp
Box 1000
Montgomery, PA 17752

LeRoy R. Haenze
Assistant Supervisor of Education
U.S. Penitentiary
Terre Haute, IN 47807

Thomas A. Hanley
Deputy Director
Program Operations
ECO Division - Job Training
5 Cathedral Square
Providence, RI 02903

Allen E. Harbort
Superintendent
Correctional Education
Box 669, Room 1030
1 W. Wilson St.
Madison, WI 53704

Gail Hargrove
Educational Coordinator
Department of Corrections
Box 44304
Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Kaye Hayter
Department of Corrections
Windham School District
Box 40
Huntsville, TX 77340

Jack Heard
Sheriff, Harris County
301 San Jacinto
Houston, TX 77002

Joe Hickl
Curriculum Supervisor
Vocational Education
Windham School District
Box 40
Huntsville, TX 77340

Ann Hooper
Corrections Specialist
National Criminal Justice
Reference Services
U.S. Department of Justice
Box 24036, S.W. Station
Washington, DC 20024

Gene Hruza
Educational Coordinator
Department of Correctional Services
Box 94661
Lincoln, NE 68509

Charles H. Huff
Assistant Supervisor of Education
U.S. Penitentiary
Leavenworth, KA 66048

Ray A. Hunt
Instructional Specialist
Social & Health Services
Adult Corrections
Mail Stop 25-2
Olympia, WA 98504

Johnie Joe Hutak
Program Coordinator
Correctional Education
La Puente Valley Adult Education
441 Bauchet St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Alton Ice
Executive Director
Advisory Council on Vocational
Education
Box 1886
Austin, TX 78767

Marianne F. Imhoff
Corrections Treatment Administrator
Department of Corrections
Box 44304, Capital Station
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Curtis Jackson
Media Specialist
Windham School District
Box 40
Huntsville, TX 77340

Albert R. Jacques
Career & Vocational Counselor
Board of Corrections
Boise, ID 83707

Donald P. Jaeschke
Associate Professor
Adult & Vocational Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

Neil Johnson
Supervisor
Vocational Education, Corrections
65 S. Front St.
Columbus, OH 43215

Shelvy E. Johnson
Assistant Education Administrator
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 1st St. NW
Washington, DC 20534

T. P. Jones
Assistant Secretary for Programs
Offender Rehabilitation
1311 Winewood Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Don Kartchner
Director
Correctional Program Development
Utah Technical College
1395 N. 150 E.
Provo, UT 84062

William C. Kea
Chairman
Advisory Council on Vocational
Education
720 Kapiolani Blvd., Room 301
Honolulu, HI 96813

James H. Keeley
Federal Program Coordinator
State Correctional Institution
Box 200
Camp Hill, PA 17111

Frederick L. Keith
Director
Programs & Services Unit
Department of Corrections
3400 N. Eastern
Oklahoma City, OK 73111

Trumbull Kelly
Administrator
Educational Services
Department of Youth Authority
4241 Williamsborough Dr.
Sacramento, CA 95823

Jack D. Killion
Supervisor
Occupational Education
U.S. Bureau of Prisons
3150 Horton Road
Fort Worth, TX 76119

Kenneth J. Klimusko
Services Unit Coordinator
Community Correctional Services
Box 143
Geneva, IL 60134

K. D. Knapp
Executive Assistant
Department of Public Institutions
State Capitol Complex
Charleston, WV 25305

E. Michael Latta
Executive Director
Advisory Council on Vocational
Education
Box 5312
Raleigh, NC 27607

Melvin Leach
Program Evaluator
Prison Programs
Central Arizona College
Coolidge, AZ 85228

Joel G. Lee
Planner
Mayor's Office of Manpower
Resources
701 St. Paul St.
Baltimore, MD 21202

William Liggett
Director
Vocational Education
1900 Washington St., East
Charleston, WV 25305

Eileen Lehman
Title IX Coordinator
U.S. Office of Education
1200 Main Tower Bldg.
Dallas, TX 75202

Eugene Lehrmann
Director
Vocational, Technical & Adult
Education
4802 Sheboygan Ave.
Madison, WI 53702

Russel Leik
Mutual Agreement Program
Coordinator
Division of Corrections
Box 669
Madison, WI 53701

Maxine Levels
Education Specialist
Federal Correctional Institution
3150 Horton Road
Fort Worth, TX 76119

Mark Levine
Commissioner
Division of Correction
6314 Windsor Mill Road
Baltimore, MD 21207

James Lewis
Research Associate
Research Coordinating Unit
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Judson Locke
Commissioner
Board of Corrections
101 S. Union St.
Montgomery, AL 36104

Daniel Long
Supervisory Auditor
U.S. General Accounting Office
4th & G Streets, NW
Washington, DC 20534

Era Looney
Assistant Professor
Home Economics Education
200 Lane Hall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Louis H. Loudermilk
Assistant Director
Secondary & Special Programs
Department of Education
Capitol Complex, B-230
Charleston, WV 25305

Jim Mabry
Commissioner
Department of Correction
Box 8707
Pine Bluff, AR 71611

Michael Maday
Auditor
General Accounting Office
Room 139, HOLC Bldg.
320 1st St., NW
Washington, DC 20534

Dyton Matthews
Assistant State Coordinator
Vocational-Technical Education
Manpower Division
1515 W. 6th
Stillwater, OK 74074

Kathleen Joan McChesney
Head Counselor
District Attorney's Diversionary
Program
200 S. Broad St.
New Orleans, LA 70119

L. Dean McClellan
Assistant Professor
Public Service Occupations
Otter Hall, Room 208
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40208

John D. McWhorter, Jr.
Vocational Teacher
Giddings State Home & School
Box 600
Giddings, TX 78942

John E. Merrick
Vocational Evaluation Specialist
Department of Corrections
Box B
St. Albans, VT 05478

William Merriman
Graduate Student
Room 103 - Industrial Education
Building
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201

Prissy Miller
Department of Corrections
Windham School District
Box 40
Huntsville, TX 77340

Terry Miller
Director
Municipal Services Division
Indian River Community College
3209 Virginia Ave.
Ft. Pierce, FL 33450

J. Clark Mitchell
Assistant Director
U.S.P. Program
Utah Technical College
Provo, UT 84601

Bill Monroe
Career Education Coordinator
Windham School District
Box 40
Huntsville, TX 77340

Alan B. Moore
Development Consultant
Southwest Iowa Learning
Resources Center
401 Reed
Red Oak, IA 51566

Richard Morgan
Education Director
Washington Correction Center
Box 900
Shelton, WA 98584

Harrison L. Morris
Educational Administrator
Department of Rehabilitation
& Corrections
1050 Freeway Drive, North
Columbus, OH 43229

Lester L. Moss
Academic Principal
Williams Attendance Center
Oakley Training Center
Raymond, MS 39154

Louis Muniz
Electrical Trade Instructor
Giddings State Home & School
Box 600
Giddings, TX 78942

Alfredo Murphy
Program Development Specialist
National Institute of Corrections
Room 200
320 First St., NW
Washington, DC 20534

John Michael Murphy, Jr.
Supervisory GAO Auditor
U.S. General Accounting Office
Room 8112, Federal Building
5th & Main Streets
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Fred Murray
Bureau Chief
Offender Rehabilitation
1311 Winewood Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Lane Murray
Superintendent
Windham School District
Box 40
Huntsville, TX 77340

Carl S. Myllo
Occupational Program Coordinator
Federal Correctional Institution
Box 1000, La Tuna
Anthony, TX 99021

James P. Neal, Jr.
Deputy Director
Professional Services
Department of Youth Services
Box 21487
Columbia, SC 29221

Mark Newton
Graduate Research Associate
The Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Duane Nielsen
Chief of Vocational Education
Occupational & Adult Education
Room 5652
7th & D Streets, SW
Washington, DC 20202

John Nunnery
Associate Regional Administrator
Employment & Training
Department of Labor, Region V
230 S. Dearborn St., 5th floor
Chicago, IL 60606

Edward W. Palmer, Sr.
Contracts Administrator
Office of Education
100 N. First St.
Springfield, IL 62704

Raymond C. Parrott
Executive Director
Advisory Council on Vocational
Technical Education
Suite 353
294 Washington St.
Boston, MA 02108

Edward Patillo
Coordinator
Juvenile Service
Box 305
Wrightsville, AR 72183

Claiborne Pell
U.S. Senator
325 Russell Senate Building
Washington, DC 20510

Anthony Pellicane
Director
Juvenile Facilities
Middlesex County, NJ 08846

Reginald Petty
Executive Director
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
425 13th St., NW
Washington, DC 20004

Kenneth A. Polcyn
Research Director
PRC Information Sciences Company
7600 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, VA 22101

Jack Popham
Vocational Placement Specialist
Department of Corrections
Box 99
Huntsville, TX 77340

Bernard F. Quigley
Regional Vocational Director
Adult, Vocational & Technical
Education
100 N. First St.
Springfield, IL 62777

John E. Radvany
Deputy Assistant Commissioner
Department of Education
225 W. State St.
Trenton, NJ 08625

Martha Randall
Vocational Planner
Offender Rehabilitation
800 Peachtree St., NE
Atlanta, GA 30308

Eric Rice
Educational Researcher
System Sciences, Inc.
Box 2345
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Brian Richey
Regional Commissioner
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Dallas, TX 75202

Robert E. Rodli
President
John R. Wald Company, Inc.
Industrial Park
Box 392
Huntingdon, PA 16652

Trudy Rogers
Education Program Specialist
Career & Vocational Education
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Fred Santaniello
Chief, Client Management
Job Development & Training
1 Weybossett Hill
Providence, RI 02903

James Satterelli
Assistant Dean
Prison Programs
Jackson Community College
2111 Emmons Road
Jackson, MI 49201

Matthew Savoren
Assistant Superintendent
Colorado State Reformatory
Box R
Buena Vista, CO 81211

Jerome J. Schmehl
Planning Consultant
Department of Education
549 Capitol Square Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55101

Ernestine H. Schnuelle
Administrator
Correctional Education
La Puente Valley Adult School
441 Bauchet St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Paul Schroeder
Specialist
The Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Ted Shannon
Teacher Educator, Corrections
Vocational-Technical Education
The Ohio State University
29 W. Woodruff Ave., Room 015
Columbus, OH 43210

Edward S. Shia
Consultant
Trade & Industrial Education
State Office Bldg., Room 344
Hartford, CT 06115

Travis Shirlay
Manager
On-the-Job Training
Bureau of Corrections
State Office Bldg.
Frankfort, KY 40601

Byrl Shoemaker
Director
Vocational Education
Department of Education
65 S. Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Rudolph Shulterbrandt
Box 653
Kingshill Post Office
St. Croix, Virgin Islands 00850

Felix Simon
Assistant Director
Rehabilitation Center
Calcasieu Parish Sheriff's Department
Box V
Lake Charles, LA 70602

Jasper R. Simpson
Assistant Director
Area Vocational Technical School
2220 N. 59th St.
Kansas City, KS 66104

Susan Sleeper
Planning Director
Iowa Crime Commission
3125 Douglas
Des Moines, IA 50310

Constantine Souris
Representative
Department of Corrections
100 Cambridge St.
Boston, MA 02202

Larry E. Spears
Correctional Warden
Board of Corrections
Box 306
Elmore, AL 36025

Gary D. Starr
Diagnostic Evaluator
Prison Programs
Central Arizona College
Coolidge, AZ 85228

Howard Steinhilber
Coordinator
Correctional Education
Moraine Park Technical Institute
234 N. National Avenue
Fond du Lac, WI 54935

Myrton T. Stewart, Jr.
Supervisory GAO Auditor
U.S. General Accounting Office
Room 8112, Federal Building
5th & Main Streets
Cincinnati, OH 45202

R. Peter Taliancich
Supervisory Auditor
U.S. General Accounting Office
Suite 800, 1200 Main Tower
Dallas, TX 75202

Philip Tardanico
Director of Education
Department of Correction
Leverett Saltonstall Bldg.
100 Cambridge St.
Boston, MA 02202

Robert Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Ben Teague
Program Administrator
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th St.
Austin, TX 78731

Elton Thomas
Program Officer
Advisory Council for Technical
Vocational Education
Box 1886
Austin, TX 78767

Anthony Travisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association
4321 Hartwick Rd., Suite L 208
College Park, MD 26740

Glen Treude
Vocational Coordinator
Giddings State Home & School
Box 600
Giddings, TX 78942

Steven Vanausdle
Walla Walla Community College
500 Tafick Way
Walla Walla, WA 99362

Anthony Ventetuolo, Jr.
Coordinator, Adult Education
Department of Corrections
75 Howard Ave.
Cranston, RI 02920

Ronald Waldron
Correctional Program Specialist
Division of Planning
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First St.
Washington, DC 20534

M. S. Walsh
Sales Manager
American Technical Society
5608 Stony Island Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637

Robert Wheatley
Graduate Research Associate
The Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Carol Wheeler
Assistant Professor
Cameron Bldg.
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77004

Charles White
Coordinator
Minnesota State Prison
Box 55
Stillwater, MN 55082

James A. White
Vocational Program Manager
Bureau of Corrections
State Office Building
Frankfort, KY 40601

Charles Whitson
Criminal Justice Specialist
The Center for Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Dave Wickliffe
Teacher-Counselor
State Penitentiary
Box 11
Angola, LA 70712

James F. Wilkerson
Research Associate
Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

George Wilkins
Intern
Vocational & Technical Education
401 Illinois Bldg.
17 West Market Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Wesley Wilson
Instructor
Houston Community College
2800 Main
Houston, TX 77004

Stanley Wood
Director of Private Industry
Department of Corrections
430 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, MN 55101

Jerauld B. Wright
Associate Director
Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
Box 5312
Raleigh, NC 27607